DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 423 UD 026 721

AUTHOR	Ellis, Elinor Wall
TITLE	Students' Perceptions of Mentor Relationships at Florida A&M University: A Historically Black Institution.
INSTITUTION	Florida A and M Univ., Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	422p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC17 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Colleges; Blacks; *Black Students; College Students; Grade Point Average; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; *Mentors; Questionnaires; *Racial Differences; Role Models; Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes; Surveys; *Teacher Student Relationship; Whites
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida A and M University

ABSTRACT

After reviewing the literature on mentoring, this report presents the results of a study of 544 students enrolled at Florida A&M University (FAMU), a historically black institution. Students responses to the following issues are analyzed by gender, race, classification, and school and college: (1) reasons for having a mentor relationship at FAMU; (2) behaviors exhibited by their mentor; (3) events that hindered or helped the mentoring relationship; (4) events that led to the development of a mentoring relationship; (5) traits of their mentor that they admired; (6) benefits gained from their mentoring relationship; (7) qualities that they felt a mentor should have; (8) qualities of an ideal mentor; (9) negative outcomes of their mentoring relationship; and (10) overall grade point average. Appendices provide the survey instrument and additional data. Data are presented in 53 tables and 3 figures. An extensive bibliography comprising separate lists of journal articles; books; unpublished dissertations; and unpublished papers is included. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Elinor Wall Ellis

Florida A·M Univ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF MENTOR RELATIONSHIPS AT FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY: A HISTORICALLY BLACK INSTITUTION

By
Elinor Wall Ellis

THE FLORIDA A&M UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION, INC.
TALLAHASSEE FLORIDA

1988

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research project has been a rewarding and challenging experience for me. It has put me in contact with people across the nation, who are interested in the mentor concept. I must pause to acknowledge the numerous persons who have helped to make this project a reality.

Thanks to Dr. Frederick S. Humphries, President of The Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, for encouraging me to pursue this project; Dr. Richard A. Hogg, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and University Provost, for challenging me to change my academic rank; Dr. Thomas A. Jackson, Professor of Education, for providing financial assistance for computer time; Dr. Melvin Gadson, Dean of the College of Education, for writing the Foreward; Mrs. Betty Brown, Computer Analyst (Innovation Park, Florida State University), for programming, and analyzing the data; Dr. Verdan Evans, Assistant Dean of the College of Education, for supervising and guiding this project from the beginning to the end; Dr. Charles U. Smith (one of my mentors), Dean of Graduate Studies and Continuing Education, for his help in securing the grant to support this study; and to Dr. Clinita A. Ford, Director of Title III Programs, for her help in putting me in contact with important research groups in the area of mentoring.

Special acknowledgements to the Deans of all schools and colleges, along with their faculty and students for participating in this project. I owe a special thanks to the following persons for their help with this research: Mr. Jeffries Jacques, Professor of Sociology; Dr. Mary Moore, Director of Testing and Evaluation; Dr. Larry Wright, Professor of Political Science; Dr. Margaret Lewis, Dean of School of Nursing; Mrs. Linda Hudson, Mrs. Carnelia A. Taylor; and Mr. Nelson Bennett.

I owe more than can be acknowledged to Dr. Lewis Pratt, Chairman of the Department of English, Language and Literature, for reading and editing the manuscript; to Mrs. Rosalyn Matthews, typist, who did an excellent job in the production of the manuscript; and to Mr. Joe Roach, Artist (IMC), for designing the cover.

I dedicate this research project to my sister, Mrs. Jessie Wall Westbrook, a Child-Care Provider for Leon County Big Ben 4C's, and my granddaughter, Little Miss Milan DeNeen Ellis. I Pledge always to be the mentor for these two. May God bless and keep them always.

FOREWORD

In conducting this research, we have been sensitive to the requirements which professional educators impose upon colleagues providing academic advice and assistance. We do not presume to tell college teachers how to guide, counsel, support, share, model, and welcome students into professions. Our aim is to function as a resource to assist the college educator or prospective college professional toward a better vision of how to function as a helping agent when fostering mentor relationships. Accordingly, the substance of this research represents a considered mean between a discussion of guidance and sponsorship principles designed to assist students in reaching occupational enhancement and a compendium of specific intervention strategies to maximize dropout prevention. Our hope is to contribute to the mentor knowledge base, to the imaginative and forward-looking conception of the college teacher's job as a whole, yet realistically to assist him/her in the performance of his/her daily functions. That such a resource is needed in these days of mounting college enrollments, augmented instructional staffs, and increased professional responsibilities, we have no cause to question the significance of this research.

The exposition of principles and practices in mentoring has too often been from the discussion of aims and purposes of guidance and counseling. Such separation of naturally allied ends and means seems regrettable, although we recognize its necessity at times. In this research, an attempt is made to related mentor practices to its underlying rationale in an educational purpose of career enhancement.

The investigation which is reported in this study represents a serious effort of a researcher who is extremely student oriented. The results of this study could be a spring board to a campus wide mentoring effort.

Melvin Gadson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1
    Statement of the Problem 9
    Research Questions 9
    Need for the Study 11
    Limitation of the Study 11
    Definition of Terms 12

II. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 13
    Mentor Concept 13
    The Mentor Function 15
        Psychosocial Functions 15
        Career Functions 15
        Exposure and Visibility 15
        Coaching 16
        Protection 16
        Role Modeling 16
        Acceptance and Confirmation 16
        Counseling 17
        Friendship 17
    Mentor Characteristics 17
    Effective and Ineffective Mentor/Protege Relations 21
    Mentoring as a Part of a Larger Retention Program . 25
    Planning a Mentoring Program 25
    Mentor Programs 27
        The Burbank Program 27
        The Canisius College Program 29
            Program Administration 30
            Results of the Program 31
            Conclusions 32
    The Role Model/Mentor Program at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County 33
    A Comprehensive Studies Program/Mentorship, at the University of Michigan 37
    Mentorship Training Programs. 40

CHAPTER PAGE

Gray's Mentor/Protege Helping Relationship Model and Major Mentor Functions/Role. 42

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES 48

The Sample 48

The Instrument 49

The Statistical Design 49

The Hypothesis 50

Sex/Race/Classification & School and College . 50

IV. FINDINGS 54

Analysis of the Data 54

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 225

RECOMMENDATIONS 229

BIBLIOGRAPHY 230

APPENDIX 247

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTERS PAGES

TABLE 1 Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Between Male and Female Student Responses to Explain Why They do not Have a Mentor at FAMU. 56

TABLE 2 Analysis of Mean Difference Between Male and Female Student Responses to Identify the Behavior Exhibited by their Mentor at FAMU. 59

TABLE 3 Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Between Male and Female Student Responses Which identify Things that Hindered or Helped the Mentor Relationship at FAMU. 62

TABLE 4 Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Between Male and Female Student Responses Which Identify Events that Led To The Development of Mentor Relationship at FAMU. . 65

TABLE 5 Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Between Male and Female Student Responses Which Identify Qualities They Admire In Their Mentor. 67

TABLE 6 Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Between Male and Female Student Responses Which Identify Benefits Gained from Mentor Relationship 69

TABLE 7 Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Between Male and Female Student Responses Which Identify the Qualities they Felt That A Good Mentor Needs to Have 71

TABLE 8. Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference between Male and Female Student Responses Which Identify Significant Qualities of their Ideal Mentor. 74

TABLE 9 Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Between Male and Female Student Responses Which Identify Reasons for Negative Outcomes From Mentor Relationship 77

TABLE 10 Analysis of Variance of Mean Difference Between Male and Female Student Responses Which State Their Grade Point Average. 80

TABLE 11 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races When Student Responses Indicated Reasons for not Having A Mentor. . . 82

TABLE 12 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races When Student Responses Indicated the Behavior Exhibited by their Mentor at FAMU 87

TABLE 13 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races When Student Responses Indicated Mentor Qualities that Helped or Hindered the Development of the Relationship 91

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTERS PAGES

TABLE 14 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races When Student Responses Indicated Events Which Led to the Development of a Mentor Relationship at FAMU 94

TABLE 15 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races When Student Responses Indicated what they Admired About Their Mentor 96

TABLE 16 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races when Student Responses Identified Desired Qualities that a Mentor Should Have. 100

TABLE 17 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races When Student Responses Identified Desired Qualities of a Mentor . . . 103

TABLE 18 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races When Student Responses Identified the Most Significant Qualities of Their Ideal Mentor 107

TABLE 19 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races when Student Responses Indicate the Negative Outcomes of Their Mentor Relationship 109

TABLE 20 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Races When Student Responses Indicated Their GPA. 112

TABLE 21 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses By Classification When They Identified Reasons The Why They Had Not Developed A Mentor Relationship While At FAMU 114

TABLE 22 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses by Classification When They Identified The Behaviors Exhibited by Their Mentor. 118

TABLE 23 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses by Classification When They Identified The Critical Events and Qualities That Hindered or Helped the Development of Their Mentor Relationship. 122

TABLE 24 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses by Classification When Identified The Events Which Led to the Development of Their Mentor Relationship 125

TABLE 25 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses By Classification When They Identified What They Admire About Their Mentor 127

TABLE 26 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses By Classification When They Identified The Qualities That They Admire About Their Mentor. 131

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTERS PAGES

TABLE 27 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses By Classification When They Identified Qualities a Mentor Needs to Exhibit. 134

TABLE 28 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses By Classification When They Identified Significant Qualities Of Their Ideal Mentor. 138

TABLE 29 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses By Classification When They Identified Negative Outcomes From Their Mentor Relationship 140

TABLE 30 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Student Responses By Classification When They Identified Their Grade Point Averages 144

TABLE 31 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated Reasons For Not Developing A Mentor Relationship at FAMU. 149

TABLE 32 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated Behaviors Exhibited By Their Mentor. 162

TABLE 33 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated the Events That Helped or Hindered the Development of their Mentor Relationship. 171

TABLE 34 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated the Events Which Led to the Development of their Mentor Relationship at FAMU. 175

TABLE 35 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated What They Admired Most About Their Mentor 180

TABLE 36 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated Gains From Their Mentor Relationship 186

TABLE 37 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated Qualities That Their Mentor Should Exhibit. 192

TABLE 38 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated Significant Qualities of their Ideal Mentor. 199

TABLE 39 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated Some Negative Outcomes From Their Mentor Relationship 204

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTERS PAGES

TABLE 40 Analysis of Mean Difference Among Schools and Colleges When Student Responses Indicated Grade Point Average . . 210

FIGURE 1 An Electic Profile of Mentor-Protege Relationships . . . 20

FIGURE 2 Components of a Four-Phase Formalized Mentoring Program For Inducting Beginning Teachers 45

FIGURE 3 Gray's Mentor/Protege Helping Relationship Model and Major Mentor Functions/Roles (Model indicates varied types and levels of help mentor provides to enable proteges to gain competencies, confidence, realistic values experience, and other qualities needed to function autonomously as a complete professional). . . . 46

INTRODUCTION

The twentieth century is swiftly passing and the twenty-first century is just upon us. Like a pendulum, education again shifts back to an emphasis on human beings who have specific developmental needs. Educators across the nation are concerned with individual interest, values, abilities, and attitudes as factors in determining the upward mobility of persons--whether in business, education, or another endeavor or pursuit.

Today more and more attention is given to mentoring as a prime factor in career development. Many businesses have found great strength in having a mentoring program to assist the beginning employee in moving from the bottom toward the top. Business has explored mentoring from the perspective of career development to the impact of mentoring on the productivity of the company. Moreover, a great deal of attention has been given to women and minorities in business. These studies have covered the following areas: "Advantages of Having a Mentor or Being a Mentor;" (Bensahel, 1977; Collins & Scott, 1978; Edison, 1980; George, 1981; Halatin, 1981; Johnson, 1980; "The P's and Q's of Mentoring," 1981). Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe (1978) suggested a mentor, who would become involved in an advisor/support relationship which would facilitate access to positions of leadership, authority, and power in management and professional fields.

Much of the excitement about mentoring can be traced to a study reported in a 1979 issue of Harvard Business Review (Roche, 1978). Nearly 4,000 executives listed in the "Who's News" column of the Wall Street Journal were surveyed about their mentoring relationships.

"Mentor" was defined by the question, "At any stage of your career who guided or sponsored you?" Of the 1,250 executives (less than 1% women) who responded to the survey, two-thirds reported having had such a relationship and one-third had two or more. What caused much of the excitement was Roche's additional findings that those who had mentors: (1) earned more money at a younger age, (2) were better educated, (3) reported being happier with their career, and (4) derived greater pleasure from their work. Roche found that long-term friendships had developed between mentors and proteges, and that four out of ten relationships had lasted ten years or more.

Because of the complexities and problems in higher education, some researchers have suggested that educators should take a look at career development as a starting point for the prevention of dropouts from the various fields, especially in teacher education. They have suggested that educators should incorporate the mentor relationship into planned interventions with those who seek a career in education. As colleges and universities, particularly the historically Black institutions, grow and expand their horizons, the necessity for mentor relationships becomes more and more important. Complex contemporary institutions need to be about the business of organization to insure that the career development needs of students are met. Therefore, a multifaceted approach is needed if higher education is to broaden its horizons and meet the challenges presented by a new breed of students and an ever-changing society.

Levinson writes in The Seasons of a Man's Life, that "the mentor relationship is one of the most developmentally important relationships a person can have in early adulthood." He cites some of the functions that mentors perform. "The mentor may act as a teacher to enhance the young man's skills and intellectual development. As a sponsor, he may use his influence to promote the young man's entry and advancement. He may be a host and guide, welcoming the initiate into a new occupational and social world and acquainting him with its values, customs, resources, and characters. Through his own virtues, achievements, and way of life, the mentor may be an exemplary that the young man can admire and emulate. He may provide counsel and moral support in times of stress" (Levinson: 97).

Hirschorn (1987) states that mentor programs are not new; however, during the past two years he noted a surge in the number of colleges that are taking an active role in aiding their prospective students. This thrust is due to the high rate of drop-outs among Hispanics, Blacks, and other economically and educationally disadvantaged youths. It has been reported that in some inner-city schools, one in every two students is a dropout. This high attrition rate is due to the fact that minorities and disadvantaged students too often receive perfunctory counseling from under staffed career and college guidance counselors. Furthermore, families do not realize that college and a serious vocation are viable career possibilities. This case in question further suggests that colleges become active, rather than passive receivers of students, Today there are many programs around the country in colleges that are sponsoring mentor programs. These programs exist not only for the purpose of increasing minority enrollment, but also for providing intervention measures that will prevent attrition. Intervention programs in colleges and universities are crucial to minority survival in today's society.

Daniel Levinson is responsible for the hard research about mentors. *Seasons of a Man's Life*, the title of Levinson's most treasured work, defines the relationship with a mentor as "one of the most complex and developmentally important" that we have.

"According to Levinson, mentors seem to appear as we enter times of impending change in our lives, stay with us through the transition, and then depart. they help us form a "dream" of who and what we want to become, and offer us support, advice, challenge, and a sense that the dream is indeed attainable." (Daloz, 1983, p. 24)

It must be noted that Levinson's work was based exclusively on a male sample. Research evidence suggests that men and women differ in how they learn and how they view their guiding relationships.

Charles V. Willie examined the life and contributions of five outstanding black leaders and educators in "Five Black Scholars": John Hope Franklin, W. Arthur Lewis, Kenneth B. Clark, Matthew Holden Jr., and Darwin T. Turner. Willie identified one pivotal person for each of these great black men. Two significant studies highlight Dr. Kenneth Bancroft Clark and Dr. John Hope Franklin from an early stage of maturation to the full growth and development and reveal a pivotal person, who served as mentor or supporter.

Clark attended Howard University during the Depression years and was graduated in 1935, when he was almost twenty-one years of age. His first influence was his mother, Marian Hanson Clark. Later came his wife, Mamie Phipps Clark, and Francis Cecil Sumner, a professor of philosophy at Howard University, who reinforced his commitment to high standards. In addition to Sumner, Clark also had contact with such intellectual giants as: Kelly Miller in education, Ralph Bunch in political science, Charles Houston in law, Alain Locke in philosophy, Abraham Harris in economics, and Sterling Brown in English. "These teachers made their students into instruments of change. The teachers were able to accomplish this goal," he said, "because they were our tutors, models and friends. They affected our lives, goals, and values." Clark, confessed that Sumner was the key at Howard: "He was strong on content and substance. He was the best read person I ever knew." Although soft spoken, Sumner was uncompromising in insistence on high standards of the student worthy of his attention. "I respect the man. I admire him. I learned from him. He became my mentor and friend. I became his protege."

John Hope Franklin, an outstanding historian, was a John Matthews Manly Distinguished professor (Emeritus in 1962) at the University of Chicago. He is one of the most celebrated historians in the United States. John Hope Franklin recalled periods of his young life when he needed that pivotal person. While working at Fisk, Franklin met a young white professor, a historian named, Theodore S. Currier. Franklin took a course with Currier, who discovered that "I had it," and he nurtured me to attend Harvard. Currier helped Franklin to find the necessary finances to attend Harvard. Currier was my "closest friend. We started out in a student-teacher relationship but became very close friends." Franklin will always remember Currier's decisive statement: "Money will not keep you from going to Harvard."

Robert Kanigel, gave some interesting accounts of mentors and their proteges in Apprentice to Genius - The Making of a Scientific Dynasty In chapter 12, "The Mentor Chain," he emphasized the theme, "Everybody who makes it has a Mentor." The mentor idea has burrowed deep into popular culture. For example, when former Morehouse College President Dr. Benjamin E. Mays died, the Associated Press obituary inscribed him as the "spiritual mentor" of Martin Luther King, Jr. (Kanigel, 1986).

The period of the 70's and 80's have been marked by increased emphasis on what to do about the "dropouts or stopouts" in higher education. Many of these students are entrapped by economic disparities. The term "high-risk," or "at-risk" is often used to describe those students. Some of these students have been recruited to meet federal guidelines for integration, to add diversity to homogeneous populations, and to bring fame and fortune to their institutions on the athletic field. Educators across the nation have registered their concern for these the "have nots." Mentoring programs aimed at retention have been tried on college and university campuses. "These programs seek to increase involvement of high-risk students by informally or formally pairing them with established members of the campus community such as faculty, honor students, or graduate students." (p. 239, Haring-Hidora, 1981) The mentor teacher concept can be traced back to the earliest stages of pedagogical history.

In 1982, Secretary of Education, Terrell H. Bell advocated a theme of "Educational Excellence." He suggested that our nation should meet the challenge of a part-industrial revolution world. In December 1982, Bell gave an address to the Southern Association of Secondary schools and colleges. He related the ability of our country to compete successfully with other nations in international trade directly to the quality of our educational system. He also linked the quality of our educational institutions to the effectiveness of teachers and others in our schools who work directly with our students. Secretary Bell identified three concerns for improving the quality of education: (1) attracting bright and talented students into education, (2) providing incentives to our most effective teachers to stay in teaching, and (3) providing incentives for teachers generally to extend and improve their skill throughout their teaching careers. Bell further suggested that these concerns be addressed through master teacher and mentor teacher programs. In contemporary cultures, mentor roles are the primary means by which knowledge is passed from one generation to another. In the past, some experienced teachers have taken upon themselves the job of advising and directing new teachers. However, this process has been relatively neglected in education, in comparison with the extent to which it has been practiced in other professions.

A recent report on American education over the last five years reveals that education is in a state of discontent. We are told that America is losing its competitive edge. Regretfully we are told that "large numbers of American children are in limbo--ignorant of the past and unprepared for the future. Students are dropping out--not just out of school, colleges, and universities, but out of productive society. Numerous retention studies reveal that Black students represent a disproportionate number of those dropouts. Even more striking are the data that show that for every 100 Black students who entered college in 1980, 60 of them dropped out by 1984. "Although some studies show that our Black colleges do a more effective job of holding on to our students than white colleges, we are still losing too many students. Colleges and universities must begin to counter this trend. For starters, in the case of Black colleges, more attention should be paid to strengthening academic advising and improving student services" (David Wilson, 1988).

Wilson (1988) suggested that Black administrators and faculty at both white and black colleges can and must play a greater role in keeping Black students enrolled once they are recruited. He further stated that administrators and faculty should begin to examine critically the quality and quantity of mentoring relationships. Charles V. Willie of the Harvard School of Education, remarked at a National Black Student Retention Conference:

> "If every Black faculty member and administrator provided quality mentoring to just two Black students, we would see a dramatic decline in Black student attrition." (David Wilson, 1988.)

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of this study will extend into four aspects of mentoring: (1) to identify the perceived overall behavioral characteristics of mentors as related by students, (2) to identify whether a general behavior factor exists among university mentors, (3) to identify positive behavioral characteristics that influenced the academic and social satisfaction/adjustment of proteges, (4) to identify negative behavioral characteristics that contributed to the academic and social dissatisfaction of proteges.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students give reasons for not having a mentor at FAMU?

2. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school and college when students identify the behavior-traits of mentors?

3. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students identify behavioral traits of mentors?

4. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students identify events that hindered the relationship with mentors?

5. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students identify events that helped the relationship with the mentors?

6. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school and college when students identify events that led to the development of a relationship with the mentors?

7. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students identify traits admired in their mentors?

8. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students identify the benefits gained from their relationship with the mentors?

9. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students identify what qualities they feel that a mentor should exhibit?

10. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students identify significant qualities of an ideal mentor?

11. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students identify negative outcomes of their relationships with mentors?

12. Is there a difference between sex, race, classification, school, and college when students identify their grade point averages?

NEED FOR THE STUDY

This study was needed at Florida A&M University due to an accelerate, and successful recruitment effort launched by the president, Dr. Frederick S. Humphries. During his period of expanding enrollment, escalating academic requirements, changing entrance policies, and increasing economic stress caused by the lack of necessary financial aid to help students from the "minority pool," a study of this nature was undertaken.

This study could be helpful to each school and college and to the University at large. It could give administrators, faculty, and staff an opportunity to see how students perceive them in the areas of helping or hindering relationships. This study could also be a spring board to writing proposals for the support mentoring programs at this University. Moreover, mentoring programs could help the University to sustain it's retention effort. This study could point up a need for stronger student personal services, especially when it concerns student advisement.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This study will be limited to the study of student (protege) perception of mentor relationships at Florida A&M University, a predominately Black University.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The term mentor is used in this study to describe one who guides, counsels, supports, shares, models and welcomes the student (protege) into the professional world.

The term protege is used interchangeably with the word student. This study refers to the student or protege as one whose welfare or career is prompted by an influencial person at FAMU.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

MENTOR CONCEPT

Today mentoring is an emerging popular topic in business and educational circles. The term "mentor" was derived from Homer's Odyssey, wherein Athene took the image of mentor for Odysseus, her loyal friend, and was given responsibility for mentoring Telemachus (Odysseus' son) when his father ventured off to fight the Trojan War. Therefore, the term mentor historically denotes a trusted guide and counselor, and the mentor-protege relationship has come to suggest a deep and meaningful association. Clawson (1980) notes that the relationship between Telemachus and his mentor was not an easy one. He stated, "it was the mentor's difficult task to help Telemachus see the error in his judgement in a way that would allow the younger protege to grow in wisdom and not in rebellion."

The father-like relationship between Telemachus and the wise, loving mentor set a standard for characterizing future mentoring relationships. History is replete with examples of such relationships: Socrates and Plato, Freud and Jung, Lorenze de Medici and Michelangelo, Haydn and Beethoven, Boas and Mead, Sartre and de Beauvoir, each of which includes a powerful emotional interaction between mentor and protege. It becomes crystal clear, therefore, that a trusting, loving, and guiding relationship on the part of a mentor can help to shape the growth and development of a protege.

Mentoring has been a topic that is being used as a subject for show talks, business seminars, and journal and magazine articles. In fact, this is swiftly becoming a period of "Mentor Mania." We are told that mentoring is the key to career and academic success, as well as a necessary ingredient in psycho-social development (Merriam, 1983). Much of the research done on mentoring shows that having a mentor or being a mentor is crucial to success. If this is true, it behoves educators to incorporate mentoring relationships into planned interventions with adult clientele. Although a search of data bases reveal a wealth of bibliographic entries, a definition of mentor was not generally agreed upon by all of the investigators. Meaning was usually defined by a particular setting where the study took place or by the scope of the research investigation.

The concept of "mentor" has been fraught with misunderstanding. People use the concepts of coach, sponsor, teacher, "rabbi," and "godfather,"interchangeably with the concept of the mentor to such an extent that it is often impossible to fathom the functions and entities they are referring to in a given situation (Zey, 1984).

THE MENTOR FUNCTION

Psychosocial Functions

Psychological functions are those aspects of a relationship that enhances a sense of competence, clarity of identity, and effectiveness in a professional role. Psychosocial functions affect each individual on a personal level by building self-worth, both inside and outside of ones career. Interpersonal relationships foster mutual trust. Each individual experiences acceptance and confirmation through interaction with another whom he/she selects as a model (Kram, 1985).

In a study of female managers, Phillips (1982), made a distinction between primary mentors and secondary mentors. Primary mentors are persons who are considered unselfish, altruistic, and caring. Secondary mentors are individuals who are part of a more business-like relationship where an exchange benefits both individuals' career advancement (Kram, 1985).

Career Functions

Career functions are those aspects of the relationship that enhance learning the ropes and preparing for that enhancement in the setting or outside of the setting. Career functions are aspects of the relationship that include sponsorship, exposure, and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging work assignments (Kram, 1985).

Exposure and Visibility

Exposure and visibility serve as a socializing force; it prepares an individual for positions of greater responsibility and authority (Kram, 1985).

Coaching

The mentor suggests specific strategies for accomplishing objectives. Coaching involves sharing ideas on how to be successful in one's pursuits (Kram, 1985).

Protection

Protection involves taking credit and blame in controversial situations, as well as intervening in situations where the junior collegue is ill-equipped to achieve satisfactory resolution (Kram, 1985).

Role Modeling

Role modeling is a psychosocial function. The mentor sets a desirable example and the protege identifies with it. The model shapes his style, personal values, and professional identity. Cross-gender relationships are limited, however functional (Kram, 1985).

Acceptance and Confirmation

Both mentor and protege derive a sense of self from the positive regard conveyed by the other. Through acceptance and confirmation the protege gains positive feedback on one's actions. This relationship provides psychological nurturing of the protege (Kram, 1985).

Counseling

Counseling is a psychosocial function that enables an individual to explore personal concerns that may interfere with a positive sense of self in the organization (Kram, 1985).

Friendship

Friendship function is characterized by social interaction that results in mutual liking and understanding and enjoyable informal exchanges about work and outside work experiences (Kram, 1985).

Kram (1985) stated that there are several factors that influence which functions are provided in a relationship. "First, the developmental task of each individual shape, what needs are brought to the relationship: individuals' important needs will affect what functions are sought out and offered in the relationship. Second, the interpersonal skills brought to the relationship get started, and unfold over time. Developmental tasks are reflected in concerns about self, career, and family." (Levinson et al, 1978; Schein, 1978; Hall, 1976; Super, 1957.)

MENTOR CHARACTERISTICS

Behavior of mentors is very important. What mentors do for and with proteges, and how enthusiastically proteges receive and respond to mentor help is paramount to the success of the relationship. Kram (1980) identified the following functions of a mentor: coaching, exposing protege to new opportunities, role modeling, counseling, confirming, and befriending. Levinson likened poor parenting in early childhood to poor mentoring in early adulthood, and suggested that a positive mentoring relationship is very important.

Bova and Phillip (1982) noted that most persons become proteges at the early adult phase or at the mid-life transition phase of the life cycle (i.e., when career changes occur). This finding is important for understanding the transition period that some teachers may potentially experience on the "early adult phase" as they progress through their first year. Erikson had concern for future generations which relate to a healthy ego identity. Consistent with Erkinson's thought, Schmidt and Wolf (1980) suggested that mentorship is one way in which older workers may understand the significance of their lives and professional contributions. Kram (1983) notes that "individuals may feel challenged, stimulated, and creative in providing mentoring functions as they become senior adults with wisdom to share." She states that mentor-protege relationships offer career and psychosocial functions for mentors in mid-life. These psychosocial functions are dependent on the degree of trust, mutuality, and intimacy that characterizes the relationship.

In "Mentoring as Learning Experiences for Adults," Bova and Phillips (1984) provide an analysis of their survey to determine what proteges learn from their mentors. Findings show that proteges learn risk-taking behavior, communication skills, political skills, and skills related to their professions. Kram (1983) notes that in mentor-protege association, the relationship is likely to pass through a series of phases:

> "The initial stage during which time the relationship is started: a cultivation phase, during which time the range of functions provided extends to maximum, a separation phase, during which time this established nature of the relationship is substantially altered by structural change in the organizational context and/or

befriending. Levinson likened poor parenting in early childhood to poor mentoring in early adulthood, and suggested that a positive mentoring relationship is very important.

Bova and Phillip (1982) noted that most persons become proteges at the early adult phase or at the mid-life transition phase of the life cycle (i.e., when career changes occur). This finding is important for understanding the transition period that some teachers may potentially experience on the "early adult phase" as they progress through their first year. Erikson had concern for future generations which relate to a healthy ego identity. Consistent with Erkinson's thought, Schmidt and Wolf (1980) suggested that mentorship is one way in which older workers may understand the significance of their lives and professional contributions. Kram (1983) notes that "individuals may feel challenged, stimulated, and creative in providing mentoring functions as they become senior adults with wisdom to share." She states that mentor-protege relationships offer career and psychosocial functions for mentors in mid-life. These psychosocial functions are dependent on the degree of trust, mutuality, and intimacy that characterizes the relationship.

In "Mentoring as Learning Experiences for Adults," Bova and Phillips (1984) provide an analysis of their survey to determine what proteges learn from their mentors. Findings show that proteges learn risk-taking behavior, communication skills, political skills, and skills related to their professions. Kram (1983) notes that in mentor-protege association, the relationship is likely to pass through a series of phases:

> "The initial stage during which time the relationship is started: a cultivation phase, during which time the range of functions provided extends to maximum, a separation phase, during which time this established nature of the relationship is substantially altered by structural change in the organizational context and/or

> by psychological changes with one or both individuals, and as redefinition stage, during which time the leadership evolves a new form that is significantly different from the past or the relationship ends entirely."

However, the mentor-protege relationships in teaching may not advance through the same stages, yet they may be similar.

Mentor relationships have been the theme of numerous pieces of research. Clawson (1980, p. 150) has chosen from various research studies a collection of mentor-protege relationships which he calls An Eclectic Profile of Mentor Protege Relationships. (See figure 1)

AN ECLECTIC PROFILE OF MENTOR-PROTEGE RELATIONSHIPS

1. Mentor-protege relationships (MPRs) grow out of personal willingness to enter the relationships and not necessarily out of formal assignments. Thus, MPRs may not coincide with formal hierarchies (D. Levinson 1968, 1969; Super 1969; Freilich 1964).
2. MPRs pass through a series of developmental stages (Gabarro 1978; Strauss 1973; Super 1953; Super et al. 1963) characterized as formation, duration, and fruition. Each stage has a characteristic set of activities and tasks.
3. Mentors are generative, that is, interested in passing on their wisdom and experience to others (Dalton, Thompson, and Price 1977; Elkind 1970; Friedlander and Green 1977; D. Levinson et al. 1976).
4. Mentors try to understand, shape, and encourage the dreams of their proteges. Mentors often give their blessings on the dreams and goals of their proteges (D. Levinson et al. 1976; D. Levinson 1978).
5. Mentors guide their proteges both technically and professionally; that is, they teach things about the technical content of a career and things about the social organization and patterns of advancement of a career (Bray, Campbell, and Grant 1974; Hill 1976; D. Levinson et al. 1976; MacGregor 1960).
6. Mentors plan their proteges' learning experiences so that they will be stretching but not overwhelming and successful. Proteges are encouraged to accept responsibility, but are not permitted to make large mistakes (Atella 1974; Cantor 1958, Gabarro 1978; Hinrichs 1966; McClelland in Kolb et al. 1974; D. Levinson et al. 1978; Polanyi 1958; Super 1963; White 1959).
7. Mentors provide opportunities for their proteges to observe and participate in their work by inviting their proteges to work with them (D. Levinson et al. 1976; H. Levinson 1968), and many times teaching them the politics of "getting ahead."
8. Proteges learn in MPRs primarily by identification, trial and error, and observation (D. Levinson et al. 1976; H. Levinson 1968; Polanyi 1958).
9. Both mentors and proteges have high levels of respect for each other (Densmore 1975; Gabarro 1978a; 1978b; Homans 1950).
10. Mentors sponsor their proteges organizationally and professionally (Dalton, Thompson, and Price 1977; D. Levinson et al. 1978; Schein 1978).
11. MPRs have levels of affection similar to parent-child relationships (Branden 1976; Brentano 1870; Denty 1906; Hall 1976; Strauss 1973; Yoshino 1968).
12. MPRs end in a variety of ways, often either with continuing amiability or with anger and bitterness (D. Levinson, 1978).

(Source Clawson; 1980, p. 150.)

FIGURE 1

EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE MENTOR-PROTEGE RELATIONS

Studies in non-education fields provide valuable points of reference for understanding the complex associations involved in mentor-intern relationships. Hunt and Michael (1983) indicate that the mentors' age, gender, organization, position, power, and self-confidence are some common characteristics of mentors. Levinson suggested the following hazards:

> "When a mentor is a full generation older - say twenty years or more - there is a greater risk that the relationship will be symbolized by both in parent-child terms. This tends to activate powerful feelings, such as excessive maternalism or paternalism in the elder, and dependency oedipal conflicts in the younger, that interfere with the mentoring functions. When the age difference is less than 6-8 years, the two are likely to experience each other as peers. They may be intimate friends or collaborative co-workers, but mentorship aspects tend to be minimal."

Weber (1980) suggests that the mentor accept the protege as an equal and a friend, yet their differences in age and experience means they are not peers. He notes:

> "The relationship more closely resembles peer friendship when the parties are closer in age and experiences, parent-child when the gap between their ages is greater."

Gender is also an important trait that influences the mentor-protege relationship. Research shows that female proteges experience over protectiveness, greater social distance, and general discomfort in male-mentored relationships (Kram, 1983). Male-female relationships have some special complexities, because both participants must deal with sexual tensions, fears, public scrutiny, and stereotypical male-female roles (Hunt and Michael, 1983).

The character of the mentor-protege relationship will be determined by the qualities of the mentor. Hanson's (1983) dissertation identifies variations in mentor types and the effects of these variations on mentor-protege relationships. Her findings concluded that the mentors demonstrated more association and provided more constructive input into subjects than did either mother or father.

In Alleman and Newman's study "Interpersonal Perceptions in Mentoring Relationships" (1984), they examined personal, actual, and perceived similarities and contrasts within pairs. Their findings indicated that mentors and proteges were not necessarily similar in measured personality characteristics or background factors. Consistent with Alleman and Newman, Zey (1984) reported the mentor relationship. He noted that most mentor relationships in his study of managers in large and small corporations were not close, nor were the relationships based on common outside interests. The pairs were not of the same social background, nor did they have the same type of schooling. The social component was their ability to work together. Working together, suggests Zey, was based on mutual trust, respect, and a belief in each other's ability to perform competently. Zey suggests that over time, a chemistry emerges between two people who work together toward a common goal:

> "Chemistry is often a result, not a cause of the mentor-protege connection; that mentor relationships develop on a much more functional basis than chemistry; and the ability to fulfill a work role emerges as a more important determinant of mentor relationships than personality mesh (Zey, 1984).

The mentor/protege relationship can get into a dysfunctioning status when (1) someone ties his career to a downwardly mobile or out-offavor mentor; (2) admiration changes to jealously; and (3) one mentor wants to advance his protege over all others.

Although the literature on mentorship is accelerating, the development of research-based projects which obey the functional principles of effective mentoring has been slow. Thias-Sprinthall, 1986; Gray, 1985; and Wagner, 1985, give an account of many states executing "mentor" and "mentor teacher programs." They suggest that these programs contain the following elements:

1. The identification of expected teachers who are willing to work with beginners.
2. Specification of activities which defines the interaction between mentor and proteges.
3. The outline of a plan for the professional development of beginners.

The manner in which each program interprets the mentor role embedded in the nature of the duties of the mentors is important. Huffman & Leak, 1987 notes that few successful mentor programs are in operation in public schools or in institutions of higher education.

There are five major reasons why mentor programs are not working as well as their designers had hoped Clemson (1987) identified some causes for mentor program failure:

1. Spontaneity and personality fit
2. Mutual benefit
3. Mentorship: A developmental, multi-dimentional relationship
4. A relationship based on trust: time and rewards
5. Affecting the entire system

Clemson (1987) summarizes the five causes above for mentor program failure as follows:

1. Ignoring the need for spontaneity and "personality fit" in the mentor relationship.
2. Inadequate benefits provided for the mentor.
3. Policies and procedures which inhibit the development, multidimensional nature of the relationship.
4. Little or no provisions or opportunities to build mutual trust between mentor and protege.
5. Blindness to the impact of mentorship program on the entire system.

Dr. Haring-Hidore, Associate Dean of the School of Education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, assessed her experiences in the retention and recruitment of students and suggested that economic concerns related to a decline in enrollments in colleges and universities are chief problems to many educators across the country. The matter of having to recruit a diverse student population has caused many colleges and universities to accept "high-risk" students.

As a result of studies by Austin, 1975; Brigman, Kuh, and Stager, 1982; and Higgerson, 1985, colleges and universities have introduced a variety of programs aimed at retaining students. These programs were in no way uniform, although they had a common theme: they were designed to increase student involvement and learning within the institution Austin (1987) suggested that this kind of involvement is not only the key to retention, but also the "Cornerstone to excellence."

Hidore describes these mentoring programs on college and university campuses and noted that they seek to increase the involvement of high-risk students. She agrees that mentoring programs hold promise for the reduction of attrition; however a search of the literature reveal no reports of such programs for addressing retention of high-risk students.

The lack of literature is puzzling for two reasons. First, there is a burgeoning literature on mentoring (e.g. Hall and Sandler, 1983; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee, 1978; Phillip-Jones, 1982), and also on successful mentoring programs in another field, business (e.g. Zey, 1984). Second, a number of educational institutions across the country have instituted mentoring programs for high-risk students, but they have not yet reported the details and results of their programs.

MENTORING AS A PART OF A LARGER RETENTION PROGRAM

Hidore warns against depending on a mentoring program as a prime agent in offsetting retention of students in schools/colleges and universities. She suggests that the mentoring program be a part of a multi-faceted retention effort. Hidore identified two factors that contribute to limitation of mentoring as the only element in a retention program on a campus. These factors deal with (1) the possibility for a successful program, which may be difficult to sustain over time; and (2) it could prove difficult to involve large numbers of students in a mentoring program, due to schedule and work problems.

PLANNING A MENTORING PROGRAM

Suggestions

1. Planning carefully before the program is undertaken.
2. Mentoring as part of a large retention program.

3. Establishing clear goals and communicating them.
4. Defining a cycle.
5. Establishing a mentoring system.
6. Developing an evaluation component
7. Selecting protege participants carefully.
8. Planning training and activities during implementation.
9. Conducting orientation.
10. Planning activities.
11. Encouraging interaction.
12. Recognizing the need for substantial and continuing commitment.

MENTOR PROGRAMS

California's Hughes-Hughes Educational Reform Act (SB 813) gave rise to varying forms of mentoring programs in many districts of the state. The unique Burbank mentoring program, a unified K-12 school district with an Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of 11,500 students, has been chosen as a successful program. Burbank's mentor program has some special features that set it apart from mentor teacher programs in other districts.

> "Burbank's mentor program provides a means for a chosen group of teachers to provide support and encouragement in response to both perceived and documented needs. It also provides the mentors with opportunities to enrich their already strong professional backgrounds. (p.38) (Burger and Perino) 1986

Organization of the Burbank Program

The organization of the Burbank mentoring program was the key to the success of the program. After intensive interviews, twenty mentors were selected for two year terms. An essay was also submitted by each prospective mentor. The role of the mentor best describes the nature of the mentoring program. Mentor duties were described as follows: (1) to serve as generalists, (2) to share thoughts and talents district wide, (3) to plan and conduct workshops each year, (4) to observe teachers, (5) to give specific help to new teachers, (6) to give demonstrations at workshop when needed, (7) to write effective statements relating to the needs assessment, (8) to provide for small group sharing time, (9) to provide for "make and take" sessions, (10) to provide for peer "rap sessions", (11) to function as "big brother" or "big sister", helping new teachers blend smoothly and comfortably into the system, and (12) to provide staff development sessions.

On the other hand, mentors pursue their goals in educational advancement. They pursue advance degrees or additional credentials, and they engage in the development of instructional videotapes to be used in their classrooms and in the district.

Mentors receive individual stipends while other funds are allocated from SB 813 to support the various workshops and programs.

The mentors select one of their own mentor teachers to serve as mentor coordinator. The mentor coordinator manages the day to day operations of the program, receives support from the district-level administrators, and serve as chairperson of the mentor steering committee, which meets monthly to address organizational concerns. The mentors are concerned about the needs of students, parents, community, school board, district administration, and site principals. (Berger, D. and J. Perino 1986.)

A MENTORING PROGRAM AT CANISUS COLLEGE

IN BUFFALO, NEW YORK

Canisius College, a small private, four year institution, is located in Buffalo, New York. The student population is largely nonresidential. The administration and staff had been concerned about student retention and the delivery of effective student services. The faculty and administration are strong in the area of student personnel services; however, they needed to give some attention to retention of their students. The research of Beal and Noel (1979) determined that retention is influenced by several factors, including student-faculty contact, support services, and attitudes of faculty and staff. This study suggested that a "caring attitude" on the part of the faculty and staff was ranked highest among positive factors associated with retention. Canisuis would therefore benefit most a from mentoring program. According to Astin (1975) student persistence depends to some extent on the degree of personal involvement in campus life. He determined that student-faculty contact had a significant impact on retention. Beal, Lenning and Sauer (1980) reported that students who left college were significantly more likely to be dissatisfied with their relationship with faculty than were those who persisted.

Thus a mentoring program targeted at freshmen was created at Canisius college. Specific objectives of the program were:

1. To arrange for senior faculty and staff of the college community to have a positive impact on new students so that their assimilation into the academic community was aided.
2. To provide a support group of peers for new students, so that issues of mutual concern could be addressed in a peer group setting.

3. To enhance the personalization of the academic environment for new students.
4. To enhance relationships between new students and faculty members and administrators.
5. To provide a continuing orientation to college life and to increase the involvement of new students in the academic community.
6. To aid new students in developing the skills necessary for them to cope with their challenges and to improve their chances for academic success.
7. To help students identify positively with the College by conveying concern and care to the students.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

The mentors were recruited from all segments of the faculty and administration, including student affairs, development, academic affairs, business and finance, and planning and research. Mentors were not remunerated for their participation, they were all volunteers. Forty-five mentors were recruited for the program, and a mentor manual was given to each volunteer. This manual included a compilation of instructional techniques and group exercises dealing with selected topics including study skills, time management, stress management, assertiveness development, goal setting, and communication skills. Since almost nine hundred new students were admitted, approximately one-half of the new students were arbitrarily selected to participate in the program. Those freshmen not selected were used as a control group, so that comparisons between mentored and non-mentored students could be made. The factors identified were academic performance, retention, and satisfaction with college.

Five mentoring meetings were arranged throughout the academic year. The first meeting was held during the New Student Orientation Program, and an agenda was prepared for each mentor's meeting which was designed to meet student needs (Miller and Brickman 1982). Some of the items discussed were: study skills, goal setting, time management and stress management. Each mentor was assigned a student staff member. These students assisted by convening the group, leading discussions, and making students feel at ease. Student staff members were given an orientation training for the program, and they were told what was expected of them as it related to their function in the overall program.

Although this program did not call for individualized mentoring, some mentors did meet with students individually. Mentors were not expected to attend more than six group sessions during the academic year, but many students did.

RESULTS OF PROGRAM

Several evaluative techniques were employed to monitor the impact of the groups on the students. They analyzed the academic performance of both the mentored and the non-mentored groups. This was done at two points during the year. The college issued deficiency notices to each group midway through the first semester and the individual student notices were tabulated. They found that freshmen involved in the mentoring program were less likely to receive deficiency notices and, if they received them, the mentored students received fewer notices than those in the non-mentored group. the program. Further analysis indicated that the program may have had some impact on student academic performance (Miller and Brickman, 1981).

A list of students who withdrew or were academically disqualified from college after one semester was obtained and analyzed. Mentors and mentored freshmen were asked to complete a written evaluation form and rated the extent to which stated objectives had been met in their group. Additionally mentors were asked to give feedback concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

CONCLUSIONS

The mentoring program at Canisius College produced a desired effect. The program had a positive impact on the retention and the academic performance of freshmen, but more importantly, the program provided an opportunity for the college community to demonstrate a concern for the students. The total operation of the program enhanced relationships between faculty members, administrators, and students, and the contact and interchange between each group and the mentors was a revitalizing and energizing experience (Miller and Brickman, 1981-82).

THE ROLE MODEL/MENTOR PROGRAM

at the

University of Maryland Baltimore County

The Role Model/Mentor Program designed by Sadie Fletcher of the University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC), is designed specifically for responding to the needs of incoming Black students. The program focuses on, but is not limited to 1) increasing the retention rate of these students in the predominantly white environment, 2) assisting in the adjustment process, and 3) providing a structured support system. The goals of the program are accomplished by utilizing the concepts and theories of role modeling, mentoring, and non-cognitive variables (as espoused by the noted researcher, William Sedlacek) to provide a warm, supportive system for volunteer participants.

The program is designed to provide benefits for participants at the following levels of participation: 1) new students as the main focus; 2) upper level students as peer leaders; 3) faculty and staff as mentors; 4) successful professionals (some who are UMBC alumni) from the metropolitan area, who serve as role models. A fifth level involving parents has not yet been implemented.

New students are invited, by letter, to participate in the program after they have been admitted to UMBC. Once a student agrees to participate, she/he is sent information detailing the participants' responsibilities, the names of the assigned peer leader and the mentor, along with the methods of contacting these persons if there are questions or concerns before the student arrives on campus. Peer leaders and mentors are given their assignment of students, including phone numbers and addresses, and they are asked to contact the students as soon as possible so that there is some initial communication before the students arrive on campus for class. Peer leaders contact the students to arrange pre-school activities where leaders accompany students on shopping trips and assist them in purchasing books. Mentors are encouraged to be creative in establishing rapport with their students.

Peer Leaders are students who have either participated in the program, served as a student leader on campus, or aspired to be leaders on campus. They are trained during the Spring semester by mentors who are actively participating in the program and by other volunteer members of the faculty or staff. These students must enroll in an independent study class through the African American Studies Department, sign a contract, and accept a list of responsibilities, expectations, and guidelines for completing the course. They are provided leadership skills training along with academic development, and they are expected to be prepared for leadership on or off campus once they have completed the course and their experience with the new students.

The peer leaders serve as a liaison between the mentor and the student when necessary. They are assigned several students with whom they have regular contact throughout the year. Having been trained themselves, they are responsible for the preparation and the presentation of the workshops to the new students. Peer leaders meet after each session and critique their performances. In addition to the responsibility for the workshops, peer leaders must also complete a paper which includes an example of a business letter, a memorandum, and a budget proposal. Moreover, they must keep a journal which reflects the leaders' perceptions of the activities and the level of student participation.

The student earn a total of three credits for active participation and fulfillment of the requirements for two semesters.

Coordination

A serendipitous benefit to the students and the program is the experience in program planning and implementation gained by the minority graduate assistant who works under the supervision of the director of the office. This also provides an unplanned but important level of interaction as the undergraduate students are motivated to pursue graduate studies by interacting with the coordinator.

Mentors are chosen from faculty and staff members of UMBC. Staff members are used for because 1) the paucity of Black faculty makes it impossible to obtain enough faculty members to support the program; and 2) Black professional staff have expertise in a variety of areas and can provide the kind of support needed for personal and academic success.

Mentors are to contact the students and try to be available when they are needed, and they can be involved in a variety of ways with the students. Students are assigned to the mentors on a same sex basis to encourage effective role modeling. For some students--particularly those who have come from a one-parent (female) family--a strong, Black, supportive male can be quite motivating.

Mentors who have skills in academic development such as test-taking, note-taking, time management, and effective reading methods, volunteer to train the peer leaders. Faculty who are not mentors often volunteer to assist in the training sessions.

The program provides a support system for the mentors as they meet to make plans for assisting the students. This support is important for some faculty and staff in a predominately white setting such as UMBC.

Role Models

Although the mentors are, in fact, Role Models, not enough positions exist on campus to provide for all the needed areas. To fill the gap, professionals (as many alumni as possible) from the area are recruited to become involved in the program. Both males and females, in as many fields as scheduling permits, are invited to the campus to interact with the students and, if possible, provide a one-day visit to their offices. The program has brought to campus Black men and women in such diverse fields as medicine, business, engineering, medical technology, social work, politics, and computer science. Needless to say, the opportunity for this group of professionals to come to the campus and interact with students, faculty and staff provides a link to the community and an experience which many say they want to have more often. In addition, it provides those who are not alumni an opportunity to learn about UMBC, and it gives the campus a more positive image in the community.

Since 1980, approximately four hundred students have been involved in some way in this unique program which has been hailed by Dr. Martha Stodt, a retention expert from Columbia University, as "one of the best, having all the components which make for successful retention."

A final component of the program has never been developed due to lack of funds and staff. This component calls for the involvement of the parents of the students, and it was designed to increase the support base for the students, especially the non-resident students. In addition, it would provide for personal development or the parents who desire to participate.

A COMPREHENSIVE STUDIES PROGRAM/MENTORSHIP AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

By Lola M. Jones

Introduction

The attrition rate of black students in college continues to be of great concern. One obstacle which students encounter seems to be a lack of access to informal information networks both within the university and in various career fields. Black Alumni are uniquely suited to assist students in overcoming these difficulties because they have successfully handled the university environment. Among their ranks are people accomplished in virtually every field of endeavor. Thus, Black alumni can be valuable partners for students as they pursue their educational goals.

Purpose

The purpose of the CSP Mentorship program is to provide Black undergraduate students at the University of Michigan with information, guidance, and motivation which will be conducive to the successful completion of their degree.

Program Goals

- Motivate students to achieve excellence.
- Provide an opportunity to establish a one-to-one relationship with a successful adult.
- Help students to set goals and develop life-work skills.
- Provide realistic exposure to a particular career.

Mentor Activities:

M - Motivate students to achieve academic excellence.

E - Encourage students to discuss their goals and formulate a plan.

N - Network with colleagues around students' needs for career development.

T - Talk with students about strategies for success.

O - Offer assistance with college and community resources.

R - Remember - be a friend - and listen.

CSP MENTORSHIP APPLICATION

Mentor's Name ____________________ Home Phone ____________

Home Address ____________________ Business Phone ________

Business Address __________________

Occupation/Title __________________________________

I would like to serve as a mentor to a University of Michigan Student for the 1986-87 academic year.

Comments/Questions:

Signature _____________________

Date _________________________

For Office Use Only

Date Assigned _____________ Campus Phone ___________

Student's Name _______________ Desk at Dorm ___________

Campus Address _______________

Home Address _________________

Student's Career Interest _____________________

LMJ/sr

(Jones, LoIa M., 1988)

MENTORSHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS

NCATE, a national accreditation association for teacher education programs, has placed in their standards the identification of a beginning teacher induction program. This simply means that this organization expects to find an induction program, in some form, in each teacher education program. This has inspired many school districts, colleges, and universities, to formulate beginning teacher induction programs. Gray and Gray (1985) developed a four phase formalized mentoring program to induct beginning teachers (See figure 2). Gray and Gray surveyed 83 studies to ascertain what kind of help beginning teachers need, and they developed a model showing mentor/protege helping relationships and major mentor functions (See figure 3). This figure identifies five levels of helping relationships: M, Mp, MP, mp and p. Gray suggested that when the protege reaches level 5, they are competent and confident enough to function without mentor help. Gray further stated:

> "They need no help in solving problems in those areas where they have acquired sufficient experience and competence. They have internalized and becomes characterized by values and other things learned during the mentoring process, thus learning to "fit in" while being able to promote change in a way that tempers their vitality and idealism with the realities of daily teaching responsibilities. When proteges need additional mentor help with something new, perceptive mentors return to the appropriate level of the model as indicated by its feedback loop." (p.42)

William and Marilynne Gray (1985) developed two models of mentoring programs. The first was a program consisting of four phases, and the second was a Mentor/Protege Helping Relationship model.

MODEL ONE, PHASE 1

The first model was divided into four phases. The first phase was identified as a period when mentors and proteges were selected and matched. Several criteria were used in this selection-matching process. The first qualification was that both mentor and protege would choose to volunteer, participate, and work together. They would have grade, subjects, ideology/philosophy in common. The mentor and the protege should be close proximity in school. The mentor should possess the following qualities: competence, people and helping oriented, open minded, flexible, emphatic listener, confident, resourceful, and politically wise. The protege should have the following qualities: receptiveness, responsiveness, values mentor help, self-analyzation, and self-improvement.

MODEL ONE, PHASE 2

Phase 2 was characterized by a training program for all concerned parties. The training was designed for (1) mentor/protege pairs, (2) principals, and (3) district support staff. The components of this competency-based training are as follows: (1) Adult Relationship Skills, (2) Communications Skills, (3) M/P Helping Relationship Model (M-Mp-MP-mP-P), (4) Four-Phase Mentoring Model (propose, plan, carry out, and present completed project), and (5) Professional roles: classroom leader, classroom manager, instructor, curriculum planner, and evaluator/reporter, (6) Supervision strategies.

MODEL ONE, PHASE 3

Phase 3 can be characterized as that portion of the program where the necessary mentoring processes are used and checked. Some of the functions are: (1) supervision strategies, (2) conflict resolution strategies, and (3) formative evaluations conducted throughout the year.

MODEL ONE, PHASE 4

The fourth phase of the mentoring model requires a year-end summative evaluation. An indepth quantitative and qualitative evaluation should be made of: (1) mentor and protege problems, (2) mentor's impact on protege, (3) protege's impact on mentor, (4) protege's impact on class, staff members, parents, (5) impact on each phase and subsequent phases, and (6) recommendations for improvements.

GRAY'S MENTOR/PROTEGE HELPING RELATIONSHIP MODEL AND MAJOR MENTOR FUNCTIONS/ROLES.

Gray's mentor/protege helping model indicates varied types of help mentors provide to enable proteges to gain competencies, confidence, realistic values, and experience needed to function autonomously as a complete professional (See figure 3). The mentor function roles are: (1) situation leadership, (2) role-model, (3) instructor/promoter of thinking skills, (4) demonstrator/teacher, (5) motivator/promoter of realistic values, (6) supervisor, (7) counsellor and (8) promoter of realistic mentoring.

Gray's model provides five levels for the mentor to interact with the protege.

The symbol M represents level one; Mp, represents level two; MP, represents level three; mP, represents level four; and P, represents level five. It is important that mentors be trained to use the Helping Relationship model. Although the model is not complex, it must be carefully monitored to make sure that set goals are achieved. One important goal in this total operation is to help proteges to reach level five. Where the protege becomes competent enough to handle autonomously the programs that beginning teachers must encounter.

(Veerman, 1984).

At level one, (M), mentors study the typical problems and concerns of the beginning teacher. They learn how to work with proteges and they teach demonstration lessons so that proteges can observe specific techniques or materials used. The mentor should arrange for protege to observe other competent teachers in the process of teaching, protect proteges from foreseeable problems and unjust criticism, promote staff acceptance of proteges, and locate resources proteges need for teaching.

On level two, (Mp), mentors draw on their experience to "role model" how to "get things done" within the politics of the school, so that proteges fit into the school's culture. (Sarason, 1971) Mentors shows proteges how to establish classroom management skills and how to prepare course unit plans. At levels one and two, mentors exercise more power than proteges because of their past experiences and their supply of valued resources.

At level three (MP), mentors invite proteges joint participation, conduct dialogues about schools' culture and ethics, and engage in Socratic dialogues. M facilitates application, and analysis; M and P jointly demonstrates something mentor and protege value each other's contributions; mentor and protege contract together; mentor and protege disucss/contract for changes; mentor and protege discuss what protege learns from others.

On level four, (mP), mentors delegate greater responsibility to proteges and give support to their efforts. The protege is encouraged to "go it alone." The mentor should give "guided practice" (Hunter, 1981) to insure that he/she can succeed. Mentors arrange guided discovery learning, facilitate synthesis and evaluation, support proteges demonstrations, encourage protege's experimental /ideals; and encourage proteges to conceptualize new values. Mentors give feedback, encourage and support protege's proposed improvements, and listen to protege's concerns. Mentors support protege's solutions and help protege incorporate what was learned from others.

By level five, (M), the proteges are competent and confident enough to function without the aid or help of a mentor. They have learned to "fit in and also to promote changes." The protege self-educates, and demonstrates independently. The protege is characterized by new values, intrinsic motivations, self-evaluations, and improvements. The protege resolves concerns autonomously and internalizes new learning. If or when the protege needs additional mentor help with something new, perceptive mentors return to the appropriate level of model 3, as indicated by its feedback loop. This Helping Relationship model is designed specifically to meet the needs of beginning teachers. It also provides professional satisfaction for the mentors.

FIGURE 2

COMPONENTS OF A FOUR-PHASE FORMALIZED MENTORING PROGRAM TO INDUCT BEGINNING TEACHERS

M=MENTOR P=PROTEGE

Phase 1: Select and Match MP/Pairs	Phase 2: Provide Necessary Training for:	Phase 3: Monitor Mentoring Process Using:	Phase 4: Year-End Summative Evaluation
Criteria 1. Voluntary participation: want to work together. 2. Same grade, subjects, ideology/philosophy. 3. Close proximity in school. 4. M qualities: competent, people & helping oriented, open minded, flexible, empathic listener, confident, resourceful, politically wise. 5. P qualities: receptive, values mentor help, self-analyzer, and improves	1. M/P pairs 2. Principals 3. District support	1. Supervision 2. Conflict-resolution strategies 3. Formative evaluation throughout year.	Quantitative and Qualitative Evaluation of: 1. M & P benefits and problems. 2. M's impact on P. 3. P's impact on M. 4. P's impact on own class, staff members, parents. 5. Impact of each phase on subsequent phases. 6. Recommendations for improvements.
Get Necessary Support from: 1. School principal and staff members. 2. School district: supervisors, consultants; and resource persons.	Competency-Based Training 1. Adult relationship skills. 2. Communication skills. 3. M/P Helping Relationship model (M-Mp-MP-mP-P). 4. Four-Phase Mentoring model (propose, plan, carry out, and present completed project). 5. Professional roles: o classroom leader o classroom manager o instructor o curriculum planner o evaluator/reporter 6. Supervision strategies.	Use Formative Evaluation to Provide: 1. Retraining. 2. New training. 3. Special support.	
improved selection, matching and support	improved training	improved monitoring and additional training and support.	

1985 Gray & Assocs. Mentorship Training Programs, Vancouver, B.C., Canada

Figure 3 Gray's Mentor/Protege Helping Relationship Model and Major Mentor Functions/Roles (Model indicates varied types/levels of help mentor provides to enable proteges to gain competencies, confidence, realistic values, experience, and so on needed to function autonomously as a complete professional.)

MENTOR FUNCTION/ ROLES	M	Mp	MP	mP	P
SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP	M tells P what to do	M sells P on what to do	M invites P's joint participa-	M delegates to P & supports	P is self-directed
ROLE-MODEL	P observes how M acts professionally with others	M teaches P "the ropes" (gatekeeping	Dialogue about school's culture & ethos	M supports P's ideas for change (gate-	P "fits in" also promotes change
INSTRUCTOR/PROMOTOR OF THINKING SKILLS	Direct instruction of basic knowledge	M queries P to check for comprehension	Socratic dialogues; M facilitates application analysis	M arranges guided discovery-learing, facilitates synthesis & evaluation	P self-educates
DEMONSTRATOR/ TEACHER	M exemplifies, leads by example	M shows P how uses demonstrations	M & P jointly demonstrate something	M supports P's demonstrations	P demonstrates independently
MOTIVATOR/PROMOTER OF REALISTIC VALUES	M displays enthusiasm P is receptive	M positively reinforces & enculturates P; P positively responds	M & P value each other's contributions; contract together	M encourages P's experimentation/ ideals; P conceptualizes new values	P is characterized by new values, is intrinsically motivated.
SUPERVISOR	M gives directives, advice, assertions	M suggests improvements P responds	M & P brainstorm agree on problem solutions	M gives feedback encourages & supports P's proposed improvements	P self-evaluates & improves
COUNSELOR	M provides anecdotes, examples, cases	M confronts P, suggests improvements; P responds	M & P discuss/ contract for changes	M listens to P's concerns, supports P's solutions	P resolves concerns autonomously

FIGURE 3 (continued)

MENTOR FUNCTION/ ROLES	M	Mp	MP	mP	P
PROMOTER OF INDIRECT MENTORING	M arranges for P to learn from others (gate-opening)	M prepares P to learn from others	M & P discuss what P learns from others	M helps P incorporate what was learned from	P internalizes new learning

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 544 students enrolled at Florida A&M University. The subjects were drawn from eleven colleges or schools of the University, and they were grouped according to sex, race, classification, and school and college. A purposeful, nonrandom sampling procedure was used to select the 544 students, which represented approximately 10% of the 5,440 students enrolled at the University.

Of the 544 students, 338 were females or 62.1 percent, 203 were males or 37.3 percent, 3 students did not identify their sex or .6 percent. According to race, Asian students represented 1 or .2 percent, 420 Black or 77.2 percent, 13 Hispanics or 2.4 percent, 87 White or 16.0 percent, and 23 or 4.2 percent did not identify their race. According to classification there were 27 Freshmen or 5.0 percent, 115 Sophomores or 21.1 percent, 221 Juniors or 40.6 percent, and 179 Seniors or 32.6 percent, and 2 or .4 percent did not identify their classification. According to school and college there were 92 in Education or 16.9 percent, 89 in Business and Industry or 16.4 percent, 88 in Arts and Sciences or 16.2 percent, 25 in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture or 4.6 percent, 59 in Pharmacy or 10.8 percent, 33 in Engineering or 6.1 percent, 41 in Journalism or 7.5 percent, 29 in Architecture or 5.3 percent, 24 in Nursing or 4.4 percent, and 64 in Allied Health Sciences or 11.8 percent.

Instrumentation

Students completed the six-page questionnaire at supervised study sessions or time periods arranged before or after class periods. The questionnaire designed for this study was based on previous research on mentor relationships. The questionnaire consists of 80 items. These items were based on elements that previous researchers found in mentoring programs for college students. All items were arranged on a 5 point Likert scale with choices ranging from disagree (1) to completely agree (5). Students recorded on the questionnaire the number corresponding to the degree of agreement or disagreement they placed on each item.

STATISTICAL DESIGN

Several analyses of variance (ANOVA) were employed to determine the significance of the hypothesis.

HYPOTHESIS

The hypotheses in this study were stated in the null. There are 10 null hypotheses for each of the four variables (Sex, Race, Classification and Schools and Colleges). This makes a total of 40 null hypothesis. The hypothesis test was concerned with student perceptions of mentor relationships at Florida A&M University, a historically Black institution. An analysis of variance was used to test the means difference among or between the variables. Below is a list of the hypotheses by variable:

SEX

1. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when their reasons for not having a mentor are compared.

2. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when the identification of behavior exhibited by mentors at FAMU are compared.

3a. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when identified events that hindered the mentor relationship are compared.

3b. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when identifyied events that helped the mentor relationship are compared.

4. There will be no significant difference between students according to male and female when identified events that led to the development of the mentor relationship are compared.

5. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when identified traits that were admired about mentors are compared.

6. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when identified benefits gained from the relationship are compared.

7. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when identified qualities that a mentor should have are compared.

8. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when identifying qualities of their ideal mentor are compared.

9. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when identified negative outcomes from their mentor relationships are compared.

10. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when identified overall grade point averages are compared.

RACE

11. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when their identified reasons for not having a mentor are compared.

12. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of behavior exhibited by mentors at FAMU are compared.

13a. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified events that hindered the mentor relationship when compared.

13b. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified events that helped the mentor relationship are compared.

14. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified events that led to the development of a mentor relationship are compared.

15. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified traits that were admired about mentors are compared.

16. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified benefits gained from the relationship are compared.

17. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified qualities that they feel a mentor should have are compared.

18. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified qualities of their ideal mentor are compared.

19. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified negative outcomes from mentor relationships are compared.

20. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified overall grade point averages are compared.

CLASSIFICATION

21. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when their identified reasons for not having a mentor are compared.

22. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when the identification of behavior exhibited by mentors at FAMU are compared.

23a. There will be no significant difference between classification when identified events that hindered the mentor relationship are compared.

23b. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when identified events that helped the mentor relationship are compared.

24. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when identified events that led to the development of mentor relationship are compared.

25. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when identified traits that were admired about mentors are compared.

26. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when identified benefits gained from the relationship are compared.

27. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when identified qualities that a mentor should have are compared.

28. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when identified qualities of their ideal mentor are compared.

29. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when identified negative outcomes from mentor relationships are compared.

30. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when identified overall grade point averages are compared.

SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

31. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when their reasons for not having a mentor are compared.

32. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when the identification of behavior exhibited by mentors at FAMU are compared.

33a. There will be no significant difference among school and college when identified events that hindered the mentor relationship are compared.

33b. There will be no significant difference among students according to school and college when identified events that helped the mentor relationship are compared.

34. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified events that led to the development of mentor relationships are compared.

35. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified traits that were admired about mentors are compared.

36. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified benefits gained from the relationships are compared.

37. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified qualities that they feel a mentor should have are compared.

38. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified qualities of ideal mentors are compared.

39. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified negative outcomes from mentor relationships are compared.

40. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified overall grade point averages are compared.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Table I - SEX

An inspection of Table 1 showed a summary of means when students responded to why they do not have a mentor at FAMU. The following data revealed: male students (m .343), and female students (m 3.13), achieved no significant gain in means when they responded that no one seemed to take an interest in them. An F ratio (F=2.67) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Therefore males and females did not differ significantly in their responses to this item.

Male students (m 3.07) and female students (m 2.72) achieved significant gain in means when they responded that they found their advisor to be conceited. An F ratio (F=4.183) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Males felt more strongly than females that their advisors were conceited. The mean scores for male students differ significantly from those for female students when they responded to this item.

Male students (m 3.35) and female students (m 2.84) achieved significant gains in means when they responded that they found most of their professors to be preoccupied most of the time. An F ratio (F=8.086) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. The means scores for male students differed significantly from those for female students when they responded to this item.

Male students (m 3.05) and female students m 2.50) achieved greater gain in means when they responded that they found most of the university administrators to be preoccupied most of the time. An F ratio (F=8.41) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. The mean scores for male students differed significantly from those for female students when they responded to this item.

Female students (m 4.15) achieved significantly greater means than male students (m 3.48) when they responded that being a loner had prevented them from developing a mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=15.508) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. The mean scores for female students differed significantly from those for male students when they responded to this item.

TABLE 1

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSES FOR NOT HAVING A MENTOR AT FAMU

ITEM II		GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
a.	No one seemed to take an interest in me.	M	68	3.4265	1.0412	2.668	.1044
		F	93	3.1290	1.2089		
		Total	161	3.2547			
b.	I do not have an outgoing personality.	M	67	3.7612	1.1559	.654	.4198
		F	93	3.9140	1.1947		
		Total	160	3.8500			
c.	I have found most of the advisors in my field to be conceited.	M	67	3.7313	1.0088	3.324	.0702
		F	93	3.4301	1.0467		
		Total	160	3.5562			
d.	I have found most of the advisors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.	M	67	3.0746	.9895	4.183*	.0425
		F	94	2.7234	1.1303		
		Total	161				
e.	I have found most of the professors in my field to be conceited.	M	67	3.6567	1.0667	1.090	.2981
		F	93	3.4731	1.1189		
		Total	160	3.5500			
f.	I have found most of the professors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time	M	65	3.3538	1.0522	8.086*	.0051
		F	95	2.8421	1.1607		
		Total	160	3.0500			
g.	I have found most of the University administrators to be conceited.	M	65	3.3231	1.0017	.124	.7250
		F	92	3.2609	1.1471		
		Total	157	3.2866			

* <.05 Level of Significance

TABLE 1 (continued)

ITEM II		GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
h.	I have found most of the University administrators to be preoccupied most of the time.	M	66	3.0455	1.1426	8.414	.0043*
		F	93	2.5054	1.1668		
		Total	159	2.7296			
i.	I have found the Chaplain to be conceited.	M	67	3.5522	.8925	.409	.5236
		F	91	3.3615	.8732		
		Total	158	3.5000			
j.	I have found the Chaplain to be preoccupied most of the time.	M	66	3.4697	.8080	.032	.8575
		F	92	3.4457	.8434		
		Total	158	3.4557			
k.	I have found my peers to be conceited.	M	66	3.3485	1.2340	.000	.9822
		F	93	3.3441	1.2203		
		Total	159	3.3459			
l.	I have found my peers to be preoccupied most of the time.	M	35	3.3429	1.0556	.020	.8868
		F	48	3.3750	.9812		
		Total	83	3.3614			
m.	I am a loner; therefore, I avoided the mentoring relationship.	M	67	3.4776	1.1330	15.508*	.0001
		F	92	4.1522	1.0156		
		Total	159	3.8679			

* < .05 Level of Significance

Table 2

An inspection of Table 2 revealed a summary of the means when males and females identified behaviors exhibited by their mentor at FAMU. The data shows that male students (m 1.81) and female students (m 1.77) achieved no significant gain in means when they responded that their mentors were interested and available to hear and counsel them about personal concerns. An F ratio (F=.221) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Male and female mean scores, therefore, did not differ significantly in their responses to this item.

Male students (m 1.85) achieved greater gain in means than female students (m 1.67), when they responded that their mentor believes in them and wholeheartedly supports them as a candidate for a future position in their field. An F ratio (F=5.18) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Therefore, the mean scores for males differed significantly from those for females in their responses to this item.

TABLE 2

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSES WHEN IDENTIFYING THE BEHAVIORS EXHIBITED BY THEIR MENTOR AT FAMU

ITEM IV	GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
a. My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about personal concerns.	M	135	1.8074	.7071	.221	.6388
	F	240	1.7708	.7330		
	Total	375	1.7840			
b. My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about professional concerns.	M	133	1.7143	.7025	1.085	.2984
	F	240	1.6375	.6705		
	Total	373	1.6649			
c. My mentor teaches me how to use various interpersonal techniques, e.g., how to get along with others.	M	134	2.2985	.9501	.460	.4981
	F	240	2.2292	.9471		
	Total	374	2.2540			
d. My mentor believes in me and wholeheartedly supports me as a candidate for a future position in my field.	M	134	1.8507	.7995	5.177*	.0235
	F	240	1.6708	.6937		
	Total	374	1.7353			
e. My mentor challenges, encourages, and assists me in improving the skills necessary to operate successfully in my field or area of concentration.	M	133	1.7068	.7363	.073	.7877
	F	239	1.7280	.7256		
	Total	372	1.7204			
f. My mentor exemplifies the essence of the professional qualities toward which I aspire.	M	132	1.8182	.8085	.735	.3918
	F	239	1.7490	.7069		
	Total	371	1.7736			

* $<$ .05 Level of Significance

TABLE 2 (continued)

ITEM	IV	GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
g.	My mentor's coaching helps me to improve my overall GPA (Grade Point Average).	M F Total	134 238 372	2.1940 2.0840 2.1237	.8086 .9554	1.265	.2613
h.	My mentor helps me to achive my professional objectives.	M F Total	132 239 371	1.9545 1.8996 1.9191	.6975 .7029	.523	.4701
i.	My mentor introduces me to infuential people and informs me of opportunities which may further my career.	M F Total	134 238 372	2.2836 2.2311 2.2500	1.0592 .9192	.250	.6173
j.	My mentor stands up for me and defends me against others, even through I may have made an error.	M F Total	134 239 373	2.7761 2.8075 2.7962	1.0523 1.0066	.081	.7762
k.	My mentor is recognized as a person with good ideas who gets positive results with the projects he/she undertakes.	M F Total	134 240 374	1.7985 1.6792 1.7219	.7335 .6606	2.591	.1083
l.	My mentor is sensitive to the experiences that I brought to FAMU.	M F Total	133 240 373	2.1429 2.0375 2.0751	.8888 .7834	1.404	.2368

Table 3

An inspection of Table 3 revealed the following data when male and female students responded to the qualities that hindered or helped the mentor relationship. Male students (m 2.64) achieved greater gain in means than female students (m 2.39) when they responded that moodiness on the part of the mentor hindered the relationship. An F ratio (F=4.054) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Male mean scores, therefore, differed significantly from those of females when students responded to this item.

Male students (m 1.82) achieved significantly greater means than female students (m 1.64), when they responded that helpfulness on the part of their mentor facilitated the relationship. An F ratio (F=6.555), was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Male mean scores, therefore, differed significantly from those for females in their responses to this item.

Male students (m 2.20) achieved significantly greater means than female students (m 3.90) when they responded that openness to share problems and feelings facilitated their relationship. An F ratio (F=12.570) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Male mean scores, therefore, differed significantly from those for females when they responded to this item.

Male students (m 2.60) achieved greater means than females (m 1.88) when they responded that availability of both their mentor and themselves helped the relationship. An F ratio (F=4.226) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Therefore, the mean scores for males differed significantly from those for females when they responded to this item.

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSES TO THINGS THAT HINDERED OR HELPED THE MENTOR RELATIONSHIP AT FAMU

ITEM V	GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
(HINDERED)						
a. Moodiness on the part of the mentor.	M	129	2.6357	1.0303	4.054*	.0448
	F	233	2.3948	1.1213		
	Total	362	2.4807			
b. Moodiness on the part of the protege	M	127	2.8425	.9794	1.840	.1758
	F	232	2.6810	1.1289		
	Total	359	2.7382			
c. Lack of punctual habits on the part of the mentor.	M	128	2.3984	.9987	2.384	.1235
	F	233	2.2275	1.0106		
	Total	361	2.2881			
d. Lack of punctual habits on the part of the protege.	M	125	2.5200	.9384	1.335	.2486
	F	232	2.3922	1.0263		
	Total	357	2.4370			
(HELPED)						
a. Helpfulness on the part of the mentor.	M	132	1.8182	.7395	6.055*	.0143
	F	237	1.6371	.6404		
	Total	369	1.7019			
b. Helpfulness on the part of the protege.	M	129	1.9845	.6845	2.708	.1007
	F	235	1.8681	.6233		
	Total	364	1.9093			

* < .05 Level of Significance.

TABLE 3 (continued)

ITEM II		GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
c.	Openness to share problems and feelings.	M	131	2.1985	.8078	12.570*	.0004
		F	236	1.8983	.7595		
		Total	367	2.0054			
d.	Availability of both mentor and protege.	M	129	2.0620	.8817	4.226*	.0405
		F	235	1.8809	.7586		
		Total	364	1.9451			

* < .05 Level of Significance

Table 4

An inspection of Table 4 revealed the following data when male and female students responded to events that led to the development of their mentor relationship while at FAMU. Male students (m 2.56) and female students (m 2.52) achieved no significant gains or means when they responded that they needed help in adjusting to their courses of study. An F ratio (F=.150) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Male and female mean scores did not differ significantly when they responded to this item. The data also showed that there was no significant gain in means for the other items (b, c, and d).

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSES TO EVENTS THAT LED TO DEVELOPMENT OF MENTOR RELATIONSHIP AT FAMU

ITEM VI	GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
a. I needed help in adjusting to my courses of study.	M	133	2.5639	1.0826	.150	.6983
	F	236	2.5169	1.1354		
	Total	369	2.5339			
b. I needed help to determine if I was in the right field, i.e., career choice.	M	134	2.9179	1.1829	1.472	.2259
	F	236	2.7627	1.1827		
	Total	370	2.8189			
c. I needed help in solving my study problems.	M	134	2.6866	1.0859	.902	.3428
	F	235	2.5745	1.0928		
	Total	369	2.6152			
d. I needed advice concerning my financial problems (books, food, rent, car, etc.)	M	134	2.8358	1.2873	.035	.8524
	F	237	2.8608	1.2115		
	Total	371	2.8518			

Table 5

An inspection of Table 5 revealed the following data when male and female students responded to what they admired about their mentor. Male students (m 2.17) achieved significantly greater gain in means than female students (m 1.95) when they responded that they admired courage in their mentor. An F ratio (F=5.979) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Male mean scores therefore differed significantly from those for females when they responded to this item. The data also showed that items 2, 3, 4 and 5 were not significant.

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSES WHEN IDENTIFYING WHAT THEY ADMIRED ABOUT THEIR MENTOR

ITEM VII	GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
1. Courage	M	126	2.1746	.8205	5.979*	.0150
	F	237	1.9536	.8195		
	Total	363	2.0303			
2. Acacemic skills	M	127	1.7165	.8347	.063	.8013
	F	237	1.7384	.7641		
	Total	364	1.7308			
3. Leadership role	M	129	1.6822	.7498	1.937	.1648
	F	239	1.5690	.7408		
	Total	368	1.6087			
4. Dedication and concern (caring)	M	130	1.5538	.6940	3.260	.0712
	F	238	1.4244	.6369		
	Total	368	1.4701			
5. Good teaching skills	M	131	1.7557	.8952	.777	.3787
	F	237	1.8397	.8633		
	Total	368	1.8098			

* < .05 Level of Significance

Table 6

An inspection of Table 6 showed the following data when students responded to the benefits gained from their mentor relationship. Male students (m 4.02) and female students (m 4.03) achieved no significant gain in mean when they responded that they gained self-esteem from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=.013) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Male and female mean scores, therefore, did not differ significantly when they responded to this item. The data also showed that the other items (b, c, d, e, and f) were not significant.

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSES WHEN IDENTIFYING BENEFITS GAINED FROM MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

ITEM VIII	GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
a. Self-esteem	M	131	4.0229	.7890	.013	.9104
	F	238	4.0336	.9180		
	Total	369	4.0298			
b. Courage	M	130	3.7231	.8261	2.546	.114
	F	237	3.8776	.9193		
	Total	367	3.8229			
c. Determination	M	131	4.1756	.7388	2.887	.0902
	F	239	4.3180	.7881		
	Total	370	4.2676			
d. A desire to achieve.	M	131	4.3435	.7920	2.354	.1258
	F	239	4.4686	.7262		
	Total	370	4.4243			
e. A desire to set goals for my future.	M	130	4.3231	.7994	.206	.6500
	F	237	4.3629	.8046		
	Total	367	4.3488			
f. Academic growth.	M	131	4.1069	.8251	.500	.4798
	F	239	4.1674	.7651		
	Total	370	4.1459			

Table 7

An inspection of Table 7 showed data resulting from student responses to qualities that they felt a good mentor needed to have. Male students (m 4.32) and female students (m 4.34) achieved no significant gain in means when they responded that concern about their academic performance was a quality that a good mentor should have. An F ratio (F=.071) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. The mean scores for male and female students, therefore, did not differ significantly when they responded to this item. The data also showed that the other items (b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, and j) were not significant.

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSES WHEN IDENTIFYING THE QUALITIES THEY FELT THAT A GOOD MENTOR NEEDS TO HAVE

ITEM IX		GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
a.	Concern about my academic performance.	M	131	4.3206	.9709	.071	.7903
		F	238	4.3487	.9723		
		Total	369	4.3388			
b.	Willingness to make constructive suggestions.	M	131	4.2366	.9514	1.639	.2012
		F	238	4.3697	.9579		
		Total	369	4.3225			
c.	Accessible to help.	M	130	4.2615	.9112	.072	.7892
		F	258	4.2899	1.0042		
		Total	368	4.2799			
d.	Provide moral support.	M	130	4.1923	.9242	.130	.7188
		F	238	4.2311	1.0194		
		Total	368	4.2174			
e.	Show interest in my professional growth.	M	131	4.2519	.9555	.252	.6158
		F	238	4.3067	1.0283		
		Total	369	4.2873			
f.	Capacity to establish corrections for me.	M	130	3.9538	1.0628	.868	.3422
		F	237	3.8439	1.0916		
		Total	367	3.8828			
g.	Willingness for mutual trust.	M	128	4.1953	.9725	.605	.4373
		F	238	4.2815	1.0314		
		Total	366	4.2514			

TABLE 7 (continued)

ITEM IX	GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
h. Open mindedness.	M	129	4.2713	.9902	.971	.3250
	F	236	4.3771	.9751		
	Total	365	4.3397			
i. Personifies good teaching.	M	116	4.0948	1.0213	1.144	.2856
	F	217	4.2212	1.0305		
	Total	333	4.1772			
j. Easy to get along with.	M	114	4.2105	.9637	1.358	.2447
	F	218	4.3440	1.0051		
	Total	332	4.2982			

Table 8

An inspection of Table 8 showed the following data when male and female students responded to significant qualities of their ideal mentor. Female students (m 4.56) achieved significantly greater gain in means than male students (m 4.34) when they responded that a strong self-concept is an ideal quality in their mentor. An F ratio (F=9.100) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Female mean scores therefore differed significantly from those for males when they responded to this item.

Female students (m 4.48) achieved significantly greater means than male students (m 4.30) when they responded that openness is an important quality of their mentor. An F ratio (F=5.65) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Female mean scores, therefore, differed significantly from those for males when they responded to this item.

Female students (m 4.41) achieved significantly greater means than male students (m 4.22) when they responded that foresight is an ideal quality of their mentor. An F ratio (F=5.50) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Mean scores for females, therefore, differed significantly from those for males when they responded to this item.

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSES TO SIGNIFICANT QUALITIES OF THEIR IDEAL MENTOR

ITEM X	GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
a. Strong self-concept.	M	130	4.3385	.7319	9.100*	.0027
	F	232	4.5603	.6350		
	Total	362	4.4807			
b. Experiences worth sharing.	M	130	4.2923	.7308	1.835	.1764
	F	232	4.4009	.7318		
	Total	362	4.3619			
c. Openness	M	130	4.3000	.7538	5.653*	.0180
	F	232	4.4828	.6708		
	Total	362	4.4171			
d. Foresight	M	129	4.2248	.7078	5.499*	.0196
	F	232	4.4095	.7210		
	Total	361	4.3435			

* < .05 Level of Significance

Table 9

An inspection of Table 9 showed the following data when male and female students responded to reasons for negative outcomes from their mentor relationship. Male students (m 1.94) and female students (m 1.71) achieved no significant gain in means when they responded that mentor withdrawal from the relationship precipitated a negative outcome. An F ratio (F=3.68) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Male and female student mean scores, therefore, did not differ significantly when they responded to this item.

Male students (m 1.93) achieved significantly greater means than female students (m 1.62) when they responded that their mentor removed himself/herself from the area. An F ratio (F=6.006) was computed at < .05 level of significance. The means scores for males, therefore, differed significantly from those for females when they responded to this item.

Male students (m 2.15) achieved significantly greater means than female students (m 1.90) when they responded that they lost communication with their mentor. An F ratio (F=4.52) was computed the < .05 level of significance. Male mean scores differed significantly from those for females when they responded to this item.

Male students (m 2.04) achieved significantly greater means than female students (m 1.62) when they responded that their mentor becomes too involved in personal functions to give them the necessary time. An F ratio (F=12.79) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Males differed significantly from females when they responded to this item.

Male students (m 1.54) achieved significantly greater means than female students (m 1.33) when they responded that illness on the part of their mentor had produced a negative outcome in the relationship. An F ratio (F=4.022) was computed at the $< .05$ level of significance. Threfore, the mean scores for males differed significantly from those for females when they responded to this item.

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSES TO REASONS FOR NEGATIVE OUTCOMES FROM MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

ITEM XI	GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
a. Mentor withdrawal from the relationship.	M	124	1.9355	1.0339	3.675	.0560
	F	231	1.7056	1.0994		
	Total	355	1.7859			
b. Mentor jealous of protege.	M	127	1.6375	1.0287	3.439	.0645
	F	232	1.4397	.9332		
	Total	359	1.5097			
c. Mentor removed himself/herself from the area.	M	125	1.9280	1.1993	6.006*	.0147
	F	230	1.6217	1.0820		
	Total	355	1.7296			
d. Protege lost communication with mentor.	M	125	2.1520	1.2052	4.523*	.0613
	F	231	1.8961	1.2398		
	Total	356	1.9860			
e. Mentor became too involved in personal functions to give the necessary time.	M	125	2.0400	1.1173	12.794*	.0004
	F	230	1.6217	1.0154		
	Total	355	1.7690			
f. Mentor as "mother hen" to protege (dependency).	M	125	1.8160	1.0805	.695	.4049
	F	230	1.7130	1.1274		
	Total	355	1.7493			

* < .05 Level of Significance

TABLE 9 (continued)

ITEM XI		GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
g.	Mentor and protege acting as buddies.	M	125	2.0560	1.1310	.585	.4432
		F	223	1.9552	1.1998		
		Total	348	1.9914			
h.	Death of mentor.	M	124	1.4560	.9209	2.413	.1212
		F	224	1.2991	.8958		
		Total	349	1.3553			
i.	Illness of mentor.	M	125	1.5440	.9545	4.022*	.0457
		F	224	1.3345	.9228		
		Total	349	1.4097			

* < .05 Level of Significance

Table 10

An inspection of Table 10 showed the response of male students (m 2.84) and female students (m 2.91) when they gave an account of their grade point average (GPA). An F ratio was not significant. Male and female mean scores did not differ significantly when they responded to this item.

TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS RESPONSE TO WHAT IS THEIR GRADE POINT AVERAGE

GROUP SEX	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB.
Male	191	2.8420	.4767	2.597	1.077
Female	301	2.9126	.4716		
Total	492	2.8852			

RACE

Table 11

An observation of Table 11 showed a summary of means for three of the four racial groups. Asian students were not computed in the data because of the small number which was represented. Table 11 concerns reasons why students at FAMU did not have a mentor. Four racial groups were the factors (Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White). Black, Hispanic, and White students responded to the 13 (thirteen) reasons why they did not have a mentor. However, the data shows no significant differences among the means for the group. The F ratios were not significant. The mean scores for Blacks, Hispanics, and Whites, therefore, did not differ significantly when they responded to the 13 items listed on the questionnaire.

TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG RACES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED REASONS FOR NOT HAVING A MENTOR

	ITEM II	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
a.	No one seemed to take an interest in me.	Asian	0	0	0	.345	.7085
		Black	129	3.2636	1.1560		
		Hispanic	4	3.7500	.9574		
		White	22	3.2727	1.1622		
		Total	155	3.2774			
b.	I do not have an outgoing personality.	Asian	0	0	0	.374	.6888
		Black	128	3.8125	1.1889		
		Hispanic	4	4.2500	.5000		
		White	22	3.9545	1.2527		
		Total	154	3.8442			
c.	I have found most of the advisors in my field to be conceited.	Asian	0	0	0	.523	.5938
		Black	128	3.4922	1.0348		
		Hispanic	4	4.0000	1.4142		
		White	22	3.5909	1.0075		
		Total	154	3.5195			
d.	I have found most of the advisors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.	Asian	0	0	0	1.198	.3045
		Black	129	2.7984	1.0708		
		Hispanic	4	3.2500	1.5000		
		White	22	3.1364	1.0372		
		Total	153	2.7255			

TABLE 11 (continued)

	ITEM II	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
e.	I have found most of the professors in my field to be conceited.	Asian	0	0	0	.991	.3735
		Black	128	3.5703	1.0550		
		Hispanic	4	3.7500	.9574		
		White	22	3.2273	1.3778		
		Total	154	3.5260			
f.	I have found most of the professors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.	Asian	0	0	0	1.849	.1610
		Black	128	3.0469	1.1214		
		Hispanic	4	4.0000	.8165		
		White	22	2.8182	1.2587		
		Total	154	3.0390			
g.	I have found most of the University administrators to be conceited.	Asian	0	0	0	.407	.6661
		Black	125	3.2560	1.0465		
		Hispanic	4	3.7500	.9574		
		White	22	3.2273	1.3778		
		Total	151	3.2649			
h.	I have found most of the University administrators to be preoccupied most of the time.	Asian	0	0	0	.609	.545
		Black	127	2.6850	1.1595		
		Hispanic	4	3.2500	1.5000		
		White	22	2.8636	1.3200		
		Total	153	2.7255			
i.	I have found the Chaplain to be conceited.	Asian	0	0	0	.297	.7432
		Black	126	3.5238	.8829		
		Hispanic	4	3.7500	.9574		
		White	22	3.4091	.9591		
		Total	152	3.5132			

TABLE 11 (continued)

	ITEM II	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
j.	I have found the Chaplain to be preoccupied most of the time.	Asian	0	0	0	.279	.7572
		Black	126	3.4683	.8456		
		Hispanic	4	3.7500	.9574		
		White	22	3.4091	.7964		
		Total	152	3.4671			
k.	I have found my peers to be conceited.	Asian	0	0	0	2.050	.1324
		Black	128	3.2344	1.2263		
		Hispanic	4	3.5000	1.0000		
		White	21	3.8095	1.2091		
		Total	153	3.3203			
l.	I have found my peers to be preoccupied most of the time.	Asian	0	0	0	1.252	.2916
		Black	62	3.4677	.9871		
		Hispanic	3	3.0000	1.0000		
		White	16	3.0625	1.0626		
		Total	81	3.3704			
m.	I am a loner; therefore, I avoided the mentoring relationship.	Asian	0	0	0	.031	.9694
		Black	127	3.8583	1.1179		
		Hispanic	4	4.0000	0		
		White	22	3.8636	1.2069		
		Total	153	3.8627			

Table 12

An inspection of Table 12 showed a summary of the means of the racial groups when they responded to the behavior exhibited by their mentor. White students (m 1.95) achieved significantly greater gains than Black students (m 1.73) when they responded that their mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel them about personal concerns. An F ratio (F=4.09) was computed at the $< .05$ level of significance. Therefore, the mean scores for White students differed significantly from those for Black students when they responded to this item.

Black students (m 2.18) achieved significantly greater mean scores than Hispanic students (m 1.89) when they responded that their mentors taught them how to use various interpersonal techniques (e.g., how to get along with others). An F ratio (F=3.91) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Thus, the mean scores for Blacks differed significantly from those for Hispanics when they responded to this item.

Hispanic students (m 2.89) and White students (m 2.48) achieved significantly greater mean scores than Black students (m 2.11) when they responded that their mentor introduced them to influential people and informed them of opportunities which might enhance their careers. An F ratio (F=4.635) was completed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Therefore, the means scores for Hispanics and Whites differed significantly when they responded to this item.

White students (m 2.32) achieved significantly greater mean scores than Black students (m 2.03) when they responded that their mentor is sensitive to the experiences that they brought to FAMU. An F ratio (F= 3.15) was computed <.05 level of significance. Thus, the mean scores for White students differed significantly from those for Black students mean scores when they responded to this item.

TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG RACES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED THE BEHAVIORS EXHIBITED BY THEIR MENTOR AT FAMU

	ITEM IV	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
a.	My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about personal concerns.	Asian	0	0	0	4.094*	.0175
		Black	288	1.7326	.7044		
		Hispanic	9	2.2222	.8333		
		White	64	1.9531	.8053		
		Total	361	1.7839			
b.	My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about professional concerns.	Asian	0	0	0	.202	.8175
		Black	228	1.6493	.6719		
		Hispanic	8	1.7500	.8864		
		White	63	1.6984	.7325		
		Total	359	1.6602			
c.	My mentor teaches me how to use various interpersonal techniques, e.g. how to get along with others.	Asian	0	0	0	3.917*	.0208
		Black	228	2.1840	.9356		
		Hispanic	9	1.8889	.9280		
		White	63	2.4286	.9624		
		Total	360	2.2444			
d.	My mentor believes in me and wholeheartedly supports me as a candidate for a future position in my field.	Asian	0	0	0	.527	.5908
		Black	288	1.7361	.7695		
		Hispanic	9	1.5556	.7265		
		White	63	1.8095	.7152		
		Total	360	1.7444			

Item IV-a.* (Gp 2 sign diff from GP 4)
Item IV-c.* (GP 2 sign diff from GP 3) < .05 level

TABLE 12 (continued)

ITEM IV	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
e. My mentor challenges, encourages, and assists me in improving the skills necessary to operate successfully in my field or area of concentration.	Asian	0	0	0	.304	.7380
	Black	286	1.7238	.7613		
	Hispanic	9	1.5556	.7265		
	White	63	1.7619	.7120		
	Total	358	1.7263			
f. My mentor exemplifies the essence of the professional qualities toward which I aspire.	Asian	0	0	0	2.300	.1018
	Black	285	1.7404	.7617		
	Hispanic	9	2.1111	.6009		
	White	63	1.9206	.7891		
	Total	375	1.7815			
g. My mentor's coaching helps me to improve my overall GPA (Grade Point Average)	Asian	0	0	0	1.787	.1690
	Black	287	2.0801	.9371		
	Hispanic	8	2.0000	.9258		
	White	63	2.3175	.8391		
	Total	358	2.1201			
h. My mentor helps me to achieve my professional objectives	Asian	0	0	0	.901	.4073
	Black	287	1.8885	.7057		
	Hispanic	9	2.0000	.7071		
	White	61	2.0164	.6950		
	Total	357	1.9132			

TABLE 12 (continued)

	ITEM IV	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
i.	My mentor introduces me to influential people and informs me of opportunities which may further my career.	Asian	0	0	0	4.635*	.0103
		Black	286	2.1713	.9887		
		Hispanic	9	2.8889	.9280		
		White	63	2.4762	.8587		
		Total	358	2.2430			
j.	My mentor stands up for me and defends me against others, even though I may have made an error.	Asian	0	0	0	.013	.9868
		Black	288	2.7951	1.0705		
		Hispanic	8	2.7500	.8864		
		White	63	2.8095	.8773		
		Total	359	2.7967			
k.	My mentor is recognized as a person with good ideas who gets positive results with the projects he/she undertakes.	Asian	0	0	0	1.506	.2232
		Black	288	1.6910	.7128		
		Hispanic	9	1.8889	.6009		
		White	63	1.8413	.5738		
		Total	360	1.7222			
l.	My mentor is sensitive to the experiences that I brought to FAMU.	Asian	0	0	0	3.150*	.0441
		Black	287	2.0314	.8419		
		Hispanic	9	2.0000	.7071		
		White	63	2.3175	.7583		
		Total	359	2.0808			

Item IV-i.*(GP 2 sign diff from GP 3 & 4) < .05 Level
Item IV-l.*(GP 2 sign diff from GP 4)

Table 13

An inspection of Table 13 showed the qualities that hindered or helped the development of the mentor relationship. A summary of the means for the racial groups showed the following data: Hispanic students (m 3.44) and White students (m 2.75) achieved greater gain in mean scores than Black students (m 2.42) when they responded that moodiness hindered the development of their relationship. An F ratio (F=5.902) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. The mean scores for Hispanics and Whites, therefore, differed significantly from those for Black students when they responded to this item.

White students (m 2.59) achieved greater mean scores than Black students (m 2.24) when they responded that the lack of punctual habits on the part of their mentor hindered their relationship. An F ratio (F-3.056) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. The mean scores for White students, therefore, differed significantly from those for Black students when they responded to this item.

White students (m 2.72) achieved greater mean scores than Black students (m 2.4015) when they responded that their own lack of punctual habits hindered the mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=2.445) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. The mean scores for White students, therefore, differed significantly from those for Black students when they responded to this item.

White students (m 1.87) achieved greater means than Black students (m 1.65) when they responded that helpfulness on the part of the mentor facilitated the development of their relationship. An F ratio (F=2.66) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Threfore, the mean scores for White students, therefore, differed significantly from those for Black students when they responded to this item.

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG RACES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED MENTOR QUALITIES THAT HELPED OR HINDERED THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RELATIONSHIP

ITEM V	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
a. THINGS THAT HINDERED THE RELATIONSHIP WERE:						
1. Moodiness on the part of the mentor.	Asian	0	0	0	5.902*	.0030
	Black	277	2.4152	1.1120		
	Hispanic	9	3.4444	1.2360		
	White	61	2.7541	.9426		
	Total	347	2.5014			
2. Moodiness on the part of the protege.	Asian	0	0	0	2.624	.0740
	Black	275	2.6945	1.1436		
	Hispanic	9	3.3333	.5000		
	White	60	2.9500	.9099		
	Total	344	2.7558			
3. Lack of punctual habits on the part of the mentor.	Asian	0	0	0	3.056*	.0483
	Black	277	2.2383	1.0255		
	Hispanic	8	2.2500	.8864		
	White	61	2.5902	.9377		
	Total	346	2.3006			
4. Lack of punctual habits on the part of the protege.	Asian	0	0	0	2.445*	.0883
	Black	274	2.4015	1.0339		
	Hispanic	8	2.5000	1.0690		
	White	60	2.7167	.8253		
	Total	342	2.4591			

ITEM V-a-1*(Gps. 3 & 4 sign diff. from Gp 2) ITEM V-a-3*(GP 2 sign diff. from GP 4)
ITEM V-a-4*(GP 4 sign diff from Gp 2) < .05 Level

TABLE 13 (continued)

ITEM V	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
b. THINGS THAT HELPED THE RELATIONSHIP WERE:						
1. Helpfulness on the part of the mentor.	Asian	0	0	0	2.656*	.0717
	Black	283	1.6537	.6633		
	Hispanic	9	1.6667	.7071		
	White	62	1.8710	.7125		
	Total	354	1.6921			
2. Helpfulness on the part of the protege.	Asian	0	0	0	1.438	.2387
	Black	279	1.8817	.6600		
	Hispanic	9	1.6667	.7071		
	White	61	2.0000	.5477		
	Total	349	1.8968			
3. Openness of share problems and feelings	Asian	0	0	0	1.074	.3427
	Black	282	1.9823	.7844		
	Hispanic	8	2.2500	.8864		
	White	62	2.1129	.7914		
	Total	352	2.0114			
4. Availability of both mentor and protege.	Asian	0	0	0	1.820	.1635
	Black	279	1.9140	.8090		
	Hispanic	9	1.6667	.7071		
	White	62	2.0968	.8240		
	Total	350	1.9400			

ITEM V-b-1.*(Gp 4 sign diff from Gp 2)

Table 14

An inspection of Table 14 showed a summary of data gathered from the responses of students by racial groups when they identified events that led to the development of a mentor relationship at FAMU.

Hispanic students (m 3.78) and White students (m 3.27) achieved greater means than Black students (m 2.69) when they responded that they needed help to determine if they were in the right field (i.e., career choice). An F ratio (F=9.50) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Thus, the mean scores for Hispanic and White students differed significantly from Black students when they responded to this item.

White students (m 3.23) achieved significantly greater mean scores than Black students (m 2.77) when they responded that they needed advice concerning their financial problems (e.g., books, food rent, car). An F ratio (F=3.433) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. White student mean scores, therefore, differed significantly from those for Black students when they responded to this item.

TABLE 14

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG RACES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED EVENTS WHICH LED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MENTOR RELATIONSHIP AT FAMU

	ITEM VI	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
a.	I needed help in adjusting to my courses of study.	Asian	0	0	0	.230	.7949
		Black	283	2.5194	1.1214		
		Hispanic	9	2.7778	1.5635		
		White	62	2.5323	1.0822		
		Total	354	2.5282			
b.	I needed help to determine if I was in the right field, i.e., career choice.	Asian	0	0	0	9.500*	.0001
		Black	284	2.6901	1.1538		
		Hispanic	9	3.7778	.9718		
		White	62	3.2742	1.2436		
		Total	355	2.8197			
c.	I needed help in solving my study problems.	Asian	0	0	0	.013	.9875
		Black	283	2.6078	1.1100		
		Hispanic	9	2.6667	1.2247		
		White	62	2.6129	1.0766		
		Total	354	2.6102			
d.	I needed advice concerning my financial problems (books, food, rent, car, etc.).	Asian	0	0	0	3.433*	.0334
		Black	285	2.7719	1.2336		
		Hispanic	9	2.8889	1.6159		
		White	62	3.2258	1.1931		
		Total	356	2.8539			

ITEM VI-b.*(Gp 2 sign diff from Gps. 3 & 4) ITEM VI-d.*(Gp 2 sign diff from GP 4) < .05 Level

Table 15

An inspection of Table 15 showed a summary of the means for the racial groups when they indicated what they admired about their mentor. The data showed that White students (m 2.44) achieved significantly greater mean scores than Black students (m 1.93) when they responded that they admired courage in their mentor. An F ratio (F=10.004) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Thus, the means scores for White students differed significantly from those of Black students when they responded to this item.

White students (m 1.93) achieved greater mean scores than Black students (m 1.52) when they responded that they admired the leadership role of their mentor. An F ratio (F=9.923) was computed at $<.05$ level of significance. Therefore, the mean scores for White students differed from those of Black students when they responded to this item.

White students (m 1.66) achieved greater means than Black students (m 1.44) when they responded that good teaching skills were admired in their mentor. An F ratio (F=2.815) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Thus, the mean scores for White students differed significantly from those for Black students when they responded to this item.

TABLE 15

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG RACES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED WHAT THEY ADMIRED ABOUT THEIR MENTOR

	ITEM VII	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
a.	Courage.	Asian	0	0	0	10.004*	.0001
		Black	280	1.9286	.8045		
		Hispanic	9	2.0000	.8660		
		White	61	2.4426	.8470		
		Total	350	2.0200			
b.	Academic Skills	Asian	0	0	0	2.781*	.0634
		Black	279	1.6738	.7941		
		Hispanic	9	1.6667	.7071		
		White	61	1.9344	.7499		
		Total	349	1.7192	.7887		
c.	Leadership Role	Asian	0	0	0	9.923*	.0001
		Black	283	1.5230	.6909		
		Hispanic	9	1.8889	.9280		
		White	61	1.9672	.8750		
		Total	353	1.6091			
d.	Good Teaching Skills	Asian	0	0	0	2.815*	.0613
		Black	284	1.4366	.6289		
		Hispanic	9	1.5556	.7265		
		White	61	1.6557	.7934		
		Total	354	1.4774			

ITEM VII-a.*(Gp. 2 sign diff from Gp. 4)
ITEM VII-b.*(Gp. 3 sign diff from Gp. 4)
ITEM VII-c.*(Gp 2 sign. diff from GP 4)
ITEM VII-d.*(GP 2 sign diff from Gp 4)
*< .05 Level

TABLE 15 (continued)

ITEM VII	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
e. Good Teaching	Asian	0	0	0	.284	.7530
	Black	283	1.7951	.8795		
	Hispanic	9	2.0000	.7071		
	White	62	1.8387	.8906		
	Total	354	1.8079			

Table 16

An inspection of Table 16 showed a summary of mean scores when students responses indicated benefits gained from their mentor relationship. Black students (m 4.15) achieved greater mean scores than White students (m 3.57) when they responded that they gained self-esteem from their mentor. An F ratio (F=12.058) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. The mean scores for Black students, therefore, differed from those for White students when they responded to this item.

Hispanic students (m 4.111) achieved greater mean scores than Black students (m 3.90) when they identified courage as a benefit gained from their mentor. An F ratio (F=8.1888) was computed at < .05 level of significance. Thus, the mean scores for Hispanic students differed significantly from those for Black students when they responded to this item.

Black students (m 4.35) achieved greater means than White students (m 3.97) when they identified determination as a benefit gained from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=6.570) was computed at < .05 level of significance. Black students mean scores therefore differed significantly from White students mean scores when they responded to this item.

Black students (m 4.48) achieved greater means than White students (m 4.16) when they responded that they gained a desire to achieve from the mentor. An F ratio (F=4.62) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. The mean scores for Black students, therefore, differed significantly from those for White students when they responded to this item.

Black students (m 4.41) achieved greater means than White students (m 4.02) when they identified a desire to set goals for their future as a benefit gained from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=6.08) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Therefore, the mean scores for Black students differed significantly from those of White students when they responded to this item.

Black students (m 4.19) achieved greater means than White students (m 3.92) when they responded that academic growth was a benefit gained from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=3.36) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. The mean scores for Black students, therefore, differed significantly from those of White students when they responded to this item.

TABLE 16

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG RACES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES IDENTIFIED BENEFITS GAINED FROM THEIR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

ITEM VIII		GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
a.	Self-esteem	Asian	0	0	0	12.058*	.0000
		Black	283	4.1519	.8431		
		Hispanic	9	4.0000	1.0000		
		White	62	3.5645	.8800		
		Total	354	4.0452			
b.	Courage	Asian	0	0	0	8.188*	.0003
		Black	281	3.9039	.8710		
		Hispanic	9	4.1111	1.0541		
		White	62	3.4194	.8971		
		Total	352	3.8239			
c.	Determination	Asian	0	0	0	6.570*	.0016
		Black	284	4.3521	.7443		
		Hispanic	9	4.2222	.6667		
		White	62	3.9677	.8291		
		Total	355	4.2817			
d.	A desire to achieve.	Asian	0	0	0	4.620*	.0105
		Black	284	4.4754	.7397		
		Hispanic	9	4.5556	.7265		
		White	62	4.1613	.7933		
		Total	355	4.4225			

ITEM VIII-a.*(Gp 2 sign. diff from Gp 4)
ITEM VIII-b.*(Gp 4 sign. diff from Gps 2 & 3)
ITEM VIII-c.*(GP 4 sign. diff from GP 2)
ITEM VIII-d.*(Gp 4 sign diff from GP 2)
< .05 Level

140 141

TABLE 16 (continued)

	ITEM VIII	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
e.	A desire to set goals for my future.	Asian	0	0	0	6.081*	.0025
		Black	282	4.4078	.7735		
		Hispanic	9	4.4444	.7265		
		White	61	4.0164	.9218		
		Total	352	4.3409			
f.	Academic growth.	Asian	0	0	0	3.360*	.0358
		Black	284	4.1937	.7804		
		Hispanic	9	4.3333	.5000		
		White	62	3.9194	.8356		
		Total	355	4.1493			

ITEM VIII-e.*(Gp 4 sign diff from Gp 2) $< .05$ Level
ITEM VIII-f.*(Gp 4 sign diff from Gp 2)

Table 17

An inspection of Table 17 showed a summary of means for the racial groups when they identified the qualities that a mentor should have. The data computed showed no significant differences among the means of the four racial groups when they responded to the items listed in this table.

TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG RACES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES IDENTIFIED DESIRED QUALITIES THAT A MENTOR SHOULD HAVE

ITEM IX	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
a. Concern about my academic performance.	Asian	0	0	0	1.804	.1661
	Black	283	4.3534	1.0257		
	Hispanic	9	4.6667	.7071		
	White	62	4.1290	.9493		
	Total	354	4.3220			
b. Willingness to make constructive suggestions.	Asian	0	0	0	.287	.7505
	Black	283	4.3074	1.0387		
	Hispanic	9	4.5556	.7265		
	White	62	4.2903	.7973		
	Total	354	4.3107			
c. Accessible to help.	Asian	0	0	0	.754	.4712
	Black	282	4.2518	1.0590		
	Hispanic	9	4.6667	.7071		
	White	62	4.2742	.7052		
	Total	353	4.2663			
d. Provide moral support.	Asian	0	0	0	.096	.9081
	Black	282	4.2092	1.0548		
	Hispanic	9	4.3333	1.1180		
	White	62	4.1774	.8001		
	Total	353	4.2068	1.0140		

TABLE 17 (continued)

ITEM IX	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
e. Show interests in my professional growth.	Asian	0	0	0	.385	.6804
	Black	283	4.2792	1.0701		
	Hispanic	9	4.4444	.7265		
	White	62	4.1774	.8782		
	Total	354	4.2655			
f. Capacity to establish connections for me.	Asian	0	0	0	1.216	.2978
	Black	281	3.8968	1.1212		
	Hispanic	9	3.3333	1.2247		
	White	62	3.8226	.9671		
	Total	352	3.8693			
g. Willingness for mutual trust.	Asian	0	0	0	.197	.8208
	Black	281	4.2313	1.0823		
	Hispanic	9	4.4444	1.0138		
	White	61	4.2131	.8188		
	Total	351	4.2336			
h. Open mindedness.	Asian	0	0	0	.968	.3808
	Black	280	4.3250	1.0531		
	Hispanic	9	4.7778	.6667		
	White	61	4.2787	.8192		
	Total	350	4.3286			
i. Personifies good teaching.	Asian	0	0	0	.022	.9781
	Black	252	4.1706	1.1035		
	Hispanic	8	4.2500	.8864		
	White	59	4.1695	.8540		
	Total	319	4.1724			

TABLE 17 (continued)

	ITEM IX	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
j.	Easy to get along with.	Asian	0	0	0	.181	.8347
		Black	251	4.2829	1.0787		
		Hispanic	8	4.5000	.5345		
		White	59	4.2712	.8269		
		Total	318	4.2862			

Table 18

An inspection of Table 18 showed a summary of the means for the four racial groups when they identified qualities of their ideal mentor. The data showed that Black students (m 4.54) achieved greater means than White students (m 4.25) when they identified significant qualities of an ideal mentor as having a strong self-concept. An F ratio (F=4.68) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Thus, the mean scores for Black students differed significantly from those of White students when they responded to this item.

TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG RACES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO THE MOST SIGNIFICANT QUALITIES OF THEIR IDEAL MENTOR

ITEM X	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
a. Strong self-concept.	Asian	0	0	0	4.684*	.0098
	Black	278	4.5360	.6775		
	Hispanic	9	4.556	.5270		
	White	61	4.2459	.6747		
	Total	348	4.4856			
b. Experiences worth sharing.	Asian	0	0	0	.299	.7419
	Black	277	4.3863	.7558		
	Hispanic	9	4.4444	.5270		
	White	61	4.3115	.6718		
	Total	347	4.3746			
c. Openness	Asian	0	0	0	1.76	.1737
	Black	278	4.4496	.7027		
	Hispanic	9	4.4444	.7265		
	White	61	4.2623	.7280		
	Total	348	4.4167			
d. Foresight	Asian	0	0	0	3.28	.0390
	Black	277	4.3863	.7114		
	Hispanic	9	3.8889	.7814		
	White	61	4.2131	.7553		
	Total	347	4.3429			

ITEM X-a.*(Gp 4 sign. diff. from GP 2)

Table 19

An inspection of Table 19 showed a summary of means for the four racial groups, when they indicated the negative outcomes of their mentor relationships. The data showed that Black students (m 1.4) achieved greater means than White students (m 1.17) when they identified negative outcomes such as illness on the part of their mentor. An F ratio (F=3.20) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. The mean scores of Black students, therefore, differed significantly from those for White students when they responded to this item.

TABLE 19 (continued)

	ITEM XI	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
e.	Mentor became too involved in personal functions to give the necessary time.	Asian	0	0	0	.407	.6660
		Black	272	1.7206	1.0777		
		Hispanic	9	2.0000	1.0000		
		White	60	1.8000	1.0218		
		Total	341	1.7419			
f.	Mentor as "mother hen" to protege' (dependency)	Asian	0	0	0	.938	.3923
		Black	272	1.7757	1.1547		
		Hispanic	9	1.8889	1.3642		
		White	60	1.5667	.8900		
		Total	341	1.7419			
g.	Mentor and protege' acting as buddies.	Asian	0	0	0	.846	.4300
		Black	267	2.0187	1.2277		
		Hispanic	9	2.0000	1.5000		
		White	59	1.7966	.9244		
		Total	335	1.9791			
h.	Death of mentor.	Asian	0	0	0	2.401	.0922
		Black	270	1.4037	.9812		
		Hispanic	8	1.0000	0		
		White	58	1.1552	.5232		
		Total	336	1.3512			
i.	Illness of mentor.	Asian	0	0	0	3.20*	.0421
		Black	270	1.4704	1.0116		
		Hispanic	8	1.0000	0		
		White	58	1.1724	.5344		
		Total	336	1.4077			

ITEM XI-i.*(Gp 4 sign. diff from Gp 2) < .05 Level

155

156

Table 20

An inspection of Table 20 showed a summary of means for four racial groups when they indicated their grade point average (GPA). White students (m 3.12) achieved greater means than Black students (m 2.83) when they gave their overall grade point average. An F ratio (F=13.9) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Thus, the mean scores for White students differed significantly from those for Black students when they responded to this item.

TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG RACES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED THEIR GPA.

ITEM XII	GROUP RACE	N	MEAN	SD	F RATIO	F PROB.
GPA	Asian	0	0	0	13.9*	.0000
	Black	375	2.8292	.4790		
	Hispanic	13	2.9700	.3630		
	White	86	3.1179	.3934		
	Total	474	2.8854			

ITEM XII - GPA* (Gp 2 sign. diff from Gp 4) < .05 Level

CLASSIFICATION

Table 21

An inspection of Table 21 showed a summary of means when students responded by classification to reasons why they had not developed a mentor relationship while at FAMU. The data showed that junior students (m 3.97) achieved significantly greater means than freshmen students (m 3.71) when they responded that they found most of their professors in their field to be preoccupied most of the time. An F ratio (F=1.75 was computed at the $<.05$ level. Thus, the mean scores for juniors differed significantly from those of freshmen when they responded to this item.

Freshmen students (m 3.71) achieved greater means than senior students (m 3.000) when they responded to the item above. An F ratio (F=1.76) was computed at the .05 level of significance. The mean scores for freshmen, thus, differed significantly from those of seniors when they responded to this item.

Senior students (m 4.16) achieved greater means than junior students (m 3.70) when they admitted that being a loner had prevented them from developing a mentor relationship at FAMU. An F ratio (F=2.09) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Therefore, the mean scores for seniors differed significantly from those for juniors when they responded to this item.

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING REASONS WHY THEY HAD NOT DEVELOPED A MENTOR RELATIONSHIP WHILE AT FAMU

ITEM II	GROUP CLASSIFICATION	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. No one seemed to take an interest in me.	Freshman	15	3.5333	1.1872	.807	.4917
	Sophomore	36	3.1389	1.1251		
	Junior	64	3.1563	1.1981		
	Senior	45	3.4000	1.0954		
	TOTAL	160	3.2562			
b. I do not have an outgoing personality.	Freshman	14	3.8571	1.0271	.238	.8697
	Sophomore	36	3.8889	1.1155		
	Junior	64	3.7656	1.2940		
	Senior	45	3.9556	1.1273		
	TOTAL	159	3.8553			
c. I have found most of the advisors in my field to be conceited.	Freshman	14	3.9286	.7300	.795	.4986
	Sophomore	35	3.4286	1.1190		
	Junior	64	3.5313	1.0686		
	Senior	46	3.5870	1.0236		
	TOTAL	159	3.5597			
d. I have found most of the advisors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.	Freshman	14	3.2143	1.1217	.570	.6354
	Sophomore	36	2.7778	1.0450		
	Junior	63	2.8730	1.0850		
	Senior	47	2.8298	1.1290		
	TOTAL	160	2.8687			

TABLE 21 (continued)

	ITEM II	GROUP CLASSIFICATION	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e.	I have found most of the professors in my field to be conceited.	Freshmen	14	4.0000	.6794	1.503	.2160
		Sophomore	36	3.5556	.8765		
		Junior	64	1.3511	1.3511		
		Senior	45	3.6667	.9293		
		TOTAL	159	3.5535			
f.	I have found most of the professors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.	Freshmen	14	3.7143	.9945	1.750	.1590
		Sophomore	35	3.0000	1.0572		
		Junior	64	3.9688	1.1679		
		Senior	46	3.0000	1.1926	*	
		TOTAL	159	3.0503		*	
g.	I have found most of the University administrators to be conceited.	Freshmen	13	3.5385	.7763	.313	.8157
		Sophomore	35	3.2000	1.1061		
		Junior	63	3.2698	1.1668		
		Senior	45	3.1111	1.0622		
		TOTAL	156	3.2885			
h.	I have found most of the University admnistrators to be preoccupied most of the time.	Freshmen	14	2.8571	1.1673	.523	.6669
		Sophomore	35	2.6286	1.2148		
		Junior	64	2.6406	1.2132		
		Senior	45	2.8889	1.1525		
		TOTAL	158	2.7278			

ITEM II-f*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM II-f*(gr. 4 sig. diff. from gr. 1) < .05 Level

163

164

TABLE 21 (continued)

ITEM II		GROUP CLASSIFICATION	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
i.	I have found the Chaplain to be conceited.	Freshmen	14	3.3571	.6333	.605	.6127
		Sophomore	35	3.5714	.7778		
		Junior	64	3.4219	.9225		
		Senior	44	3.6136	.9697		
		TOTAL	157	3.5032			
j.	I have found the Chaplain to be preoccupied most of the time.	Freshmen	14	3.3571	.6333	.198	.8974
		Sophomore	35	3.5143	.7425		
		Junior	64	3.4219	.8127		
		Senior	44	3.5000	.9765		
		TOTAL	157	3.4586			
k.	I have found my peers to be conceited.	Freshmen	14	3.2857	1.0690	.914	.4358
		Sophomore	35	3.0571	1.2821		
		Junior	64	3.4063	1.2178		
		Senior	45	3.4889	1.2362		
		TOTAL	158	3.3418			
l.	I have found my peers to be preoccupied most of the time.	Freshmen	6	3.8333	.4082	.660	.5794
		Sophomore	13	3.3846	1.1209		
		Junior	38	3.2368	1.0249		
		Senior	26	3.4231	1.0266		
		TOTAL	83	3.3614			
m.	I am a loner; therefore, I avoided the mentoring relationship.	Freshmen	14	4.1429	.7703	2.091 *	.1036
		Sophomore	35	3.6857	1.2549		
		Junior	64	3.7031	1.1224		
		Senior	45	4.1556	1.0435		
		TOTAL	158	3.8671			

ITEM II-m*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 4)

Table 22

An inspection of Table 22 showed a summary of means when the four classification groups identified behaviors exhibited by their mentor. The data showed that junior students (m 1.88) achieved greater means than senior students (m 1.70) when they responded that their mentor was interested and available to counsel them about their personal concerns. An F ratio (F=1.95) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. The mean scores for juniors, therefore, differed significantly from seniors those for when they responded to this item.

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING BEHAVIORS EXHIBITED BY THEIR MENTOR

ITEM IV	GROUP CLASSIFICATION	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about personal concerns.	Freshmen	12	1.9167	.6686	1.953	.1206
	Sophomore	79	1.7089	.6632	*	
	Junior	157	1.8790	.7954		
	Senior	129	1.6977	.6568		
	TOTAL	377	1.7825			
b. My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about professional concerns.	Freshmen	12	1.9167	.5149	2.307	.0763
	Sophomore	79	1.7468	.8392		
	Junior	156	1.6923	.6779		
	Senior	128	1.5469	.5731		
	TOTAL	375				
c. My mentor teaches me how to use various interpersonal techniques, e.g., how to get along with others.	Freshmen	12	2.2500	.8660	.795	.4972
	Sophomore	79	2.2658	.9297		
	Junior	156	2.3205	.9967		
	Senior	129	2.1473	.9109		
	TOTAL	376	2.2473			
d. My mentor believes in me and wholeheartedly supports me as a candidate for a future position in my field.	Freshmen	12	1.5833	.5149	.803	.4929
	Sophomore	79	1.8101	.8177		
	Junior	156	1.7821	.7474		
	Senior	129	1.6822	.7393		
	TOTAL	376	1.7473			

ITEM IV-a*(gr. 4 sig. diff. from gr. 3) < .05 Level

TABLE 22 (continued)

	ITEM IV	GROUP CLASSIFICATION	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e.	My mentor challenges, encourages and assists me in improving the skills necessary to operate successfully in my field or area of concentration.	Freshmen	12	1.7500	.6216	.007	.9722
		Sophomore	79	1.7595	.7715		
		Junior	156	1.7308	.7479		
		Senior	127	1.7087	.7571		
		TOTAL	374	1.7299			
f.	My mentor exemplifies the essence of the professional qualities toward which I aspire.	Freshmen	12	2.0000	.6030	.425	.7351
		Sophomore	79	1.7722	.7502		
		Junior	155	1.7935	.7788		
		Senior	127	1.7480	.7660		
		TOTAL	373	1.7802			
g.	My mentor's coaching helps me to improve my overall GPA (Grade Point Average).	Freshmen	12	2.3333	.6513	.640	.5898
		Sophomore	79	2.0506	.9285		
		Junior	154	2.1039	.9230		
		Senior	129	2.1938	.9361		
		TOTAL	374	2.1310			
h.	My mentor helps me to achieve my professional objectives.	Freshmen	12	2.0833	.5149	.579	.6289
		Sophomore	79	1.9144	.7876		
		Junior	153	1.9542	.7103		
		Senior	129	1.8682	.6420		
		TOTAL	373	1.9196			
i.	My mentor introduces me to influential people and informs me of opportunities which may further my career.	Freshmen	12	1.9167	.6686	.844	.4706
		Sophomore	78	2.1795	1.0160		
		Junior	158	2.3141	.9759		
		Senior	128	2.2344	.9597		
		TOTAL	374				

TABLE 22 (continued)

ITEM IV	GROUP CLASSIFICATION	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
j. My mentor stands up for me and defends me against others, even though I may have made an error.	Freshmen	12	2.7500	.7538	.656	.5798
	Sophomore	79	2.9241	1.0225		
	Junior	155	2.8000	1.0090		
	Senior	129	2.7209	1.0531		
	TOTAL	375	2.7973			
k. My mentor is recognized as a person with good ideas who gets positive results with the projects he/she undertakes.	Freshmen	12	1.9167	.6686	.577	.6302
	Sophomore	79	1.7468	.7921		
	Junior	156	1.7372	.6920		
	Senior	129	1.6744	.6270		
	TOTAL	376	1.7234			
l. My mentor is sensitive to the experiences that I brought to FAMU.	Freshmen	12	2.2500	.7538	.486	.6923
	Sophomore	79	2.0127	.8396		
	Junior	155	2.0645	.8113		
	Senior	129	2.1240	.8386		
	TOTAL	375	2.0800			

Table 23

An inspection of Table 23 showed a summary of means when the four classification groups responded to critical events and qualities that hindered or helped the development of their mentor relationship. The data showed that freshmen students (m 3.00) achieved greater means than junior students (m 2.13) when they responded that the lack of punctual habits on the part of the mentor hindered the development of the relationship; freshmen students (m 3.00) achieved greater means than senior students (m 2.32) when they responded to this same item. An F ratio (F=3.53) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. The mean scores for freshmen differed significantly from those of juniors and the mean scores for freshmen differed significantly from those of seniors when they responded to this item.

Freshmen students (m 2.45) achieved greater means than junior students (m 1.94) when they responded that openness to share problems and feelings helped the development of the mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=1.49) was computed at $<.05$ level of significance. Thus, the mean scores for freshmen differed significantly from those of juniors when they responded to this item.

TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING CRITICAL EVENTS AND QUALITIES THAT HINDERED OR HELPED THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

ITEM V-A	GROUP CLASSIFICATION	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. THINGS THAT HINDERED THE RELATIONSHIP WERE:						
1. Moodiness on the part of the mentor.	Freshmen	11	2.4545	1.0357	.222	.8812
	Sophomore	75	2.5600	1.1299		
	Junior	150	2.4800	1.0913		
	Senior	128	2.4297	1.1061		
	TOTAL	364				
2. Moodiness on the part of the protege'.	Freshmen	11	2.3636	.9244	.756	.5193
	Sophomore	75	2.8000	1.1150		
	Junior	148	2.6824	1.0565		
	Senior	127	2.7953	1.1293		
	TOTAL	361	2.7368			
3. Lack of punctual habits on the part of the mentor.	Freshmen	11	3.0000	1.0000	3.533	.0150
	Sophomore	75	2.4267	.9888	*	
	Junior	148	2.1342	.9632	*	
	Senior	128	2.3203	1.0569		
	TOTAL	363	2.2865			
4. Lack of punctual habits on the part of the protege.	Freshmen	11	2.5455	.8202	.078	.9718
	Sophomore	74	2.4595	.9678		
	Junior	147	2.4150	1.0781		
	Senior	127	2.4331	.9561		
	TOTAL	359	2.4345			

ITEM V-a-3*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1) < .05 Level
ITEM V-a-3*(gr. 4 sig. diff. from gr. 1)

TABLE 23 (continued)

ITEM V-B	GROUP CLASSIFICATION	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
b. THINGS THAT HELPED THE RELATIONSHIP WERE:						
1. Helpfulness on the part of the mentor.	Freshmen	11	1.9091	.3015	.476	.6995
	Sophomore	78	1.6795	.6545		
	Junior	152	1.7237	.7113		
	Senior	130	1.6769	.6844		
	TOTAL	371	1.7035			
2. Helpfulness on the part of the protege'.	Freshmen	11	1.8182	.4045	.243	.8661
	Sophomore	77	1.9610	.6165		
	Junior	149	1.9060	.6812		
	Senior	129	1.8992	.6477		
	TOTAL	366	1.9126			
3. Availability of both mentor and protege'.	Freshmen	11	2.2727	.9045	1.442	.2301
	Sophomore	78	2.0769	.7520		
	Junior	150	2.0467	.7971		
	Senior	130	1.9077	.7820		
	TOTAL	369	2.0108			
4. Openness to share problems and feelings.	Freshmen	11	2.4545	.9342	1.493	.2162
	Sophomore	76	1.9211	.6882	*	
	Junior	150	1.9400	.8765		
	Senior	129	1.9380	.7680		
	TOTAL	366	1.9508			

ITEM V-b-4*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)   < .05 Level

Table 24

An inspection of Table 24 showed a summary of means when four classification groups responded by identifying events that led to the development of their mentor relationship. The data showed that senior students (m 2.81) achieved greater means than sophomore students (m 2.38), and senior students (m 2.81) achieved greater means than junior students (m 2.54) when they identified the need for help in solving study problems as an event that led to the development of their mentor relationship. An F ratio ($F=3.092$) was computed at the $< .05$ level of significance. The mean scores for seniors, therefore, differed significantly from those of sophomores and juniors when they responded to this item.

Senior students (m 3.08) and junior students (m 2.87) achieved greater means than sophomore students (m 2.46) when they identified the need for advice on financial problems as an event that led to the development of their mentor relationship. An F ratio ($F=4.34$) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Senior and junior mean scores, therefore, differed significantly from those of sophomores when they responded to this item.

TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING EVENTS WHICH LED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

	ITEM VI	GROUP CLASSIFICATION	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a.	I needed help in adjusting to my courses of study.	Freshmen	12	3.000	.9535	2.175	.0906
		Sophomore	78	2.3590	1.0441		
		Junior	152	2.4803	1.1274		
		Senior	129	2.6744	1.1261		
		TOTAL	371	2.5391			
b.	I needed help to determine if I was in the right field, i.e., career choice.	Freshmen	12	3.0000	.7385	.810	.4892
		Sophomore	78	2.6282	1.0333		
		Junior	153	2.8431	1.2572		
		Senior	129	2.8527	1.2126		
		TOTAL	372				
c.	I needed help in solving my study problems.	Freshmen	12	2.8333	.5774	3.092	.0270
		Sophomore	77	2.3766	1.0005	*	
		Junior	153	2.5425	1.0881	*	
		Senior	129	2.8140	1.1509		
		TOTAL	371	2.6119			
d.	I needed advise concerning my financial problems (books, food, rent, car, etc.).	Freshmen	12	2.5833	.9962	4.341	.0051
		Sophomore	78	2.4615	1.1246		
		Junior	153	2.8693	1.2757		
		Senior	130	3.0769	1.2239		
		TOTAL	373	2.8472			

ITEM VI-c*(gr. 2 sig. diff. from gr. 4)
ITEM VI-c*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 4)

Item VI-d*(gr. 2 sig. diff. from gr. 3)
ITEM VI-d*(gr. 2 sig. diff. from gr. 4)

<.05 Level

Table 25

An inspection of Table 25 showed a summary of means when four classification groups responded by identifying what they admired about their mentor. The data showed that freshmen students (m 1.85) achieved significantly greater means than sophomore students (m 1.36) when they responded that dedication and concern (caring) was a factor that they admired in their mentor. An F ratio (F=2.03) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. The mean scores for freshmen, therefore, differed significantly from those of sophomores when they responded to this item.

TABLE 25

. ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING WHAT THEY ADMIRED ABOUT THEIR MENTOR

ITEM VII	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Courage	Freshmen	12	2.2500	.7538	.829	.4788
	Sophomore	78	1.9231	.8021		
	Junior	148	2.0338	.8525		
	Senior	127	2.0709	.8085		
	TOTAL	365	2.0301			
b. Academic skills.	Freshmen	12	1.9167	.7930	1.611	.186
	Sophomore	78	1.7308	.8166		
	Junior	148	1.6284	.7217		
	Senior	128	1.8203	.8365		
	TOTAL	366	1.7268			
c. Leadership role.	Freshmen	12	1.7500	.6216	.636	.5919
	Sophomore	78	1.5641	.7660		
	Junior	151	1.5695	.7617		
	Senior	129	1.6667	.7217		
	TOTAL	370	1.6081			
d. Dedication and concern (caring)	Freshmen	12	1.8333	.5774	2.026	.1099
	Sophomore	78	1.3590	.5805	*	
	Junior	151	1.4834	.7198		
	Senior	129	1.4884	.6265		
	TOTAL	370	1.4703			

ITEM VII-d*(Gp. 2 sign. diff. from Gp. 1)

TABLE 25 (continued)

ITEM VII	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e. Good teaching skills.	Freshmen	12	2.2500	.4523	1.153	.3270
	Sophomore	78	1.7949	.8880		
	Junior	150	1.8133	.9224		
	Senior	130	1.7615	.8334		
	TOTAL	370	1.8054			

Table 26

An inspection of Table 26 showed a summary of means when the classification groups responded by identifying benefits gained from their mentor relationship. The data showed that sophomore students (m 4.21), and senior students (m 4.11) achieved greater means than freshmen students (m 3.50), and sophomore students (m 4.21) achieved greater means than junior students (m 3.92) when they responded that they gained self-esteem of significance. An F-ratio (F=3.63) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Sophomore and senior mean scores differed significantly from freshman mean scores, and sophomore mean scores differed significantly from junior mean scores when they responded to this item.

Sophomore students (m 3.90), senior students (m 3.89) and junior students (m 3.79) achieved significantly greater means than freshmen students (m 3.17) when they responded that they selected courage as a benefit gained from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=2.737) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Sophomores, seniors and juniors had mean scores which differed significantly from those of freshmen when they responded to this item.

Sophomore students (m 4.35) achieved significantly greater means than freshmen students (m 3.83) when they responded that determination was a benefit gained from the mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=1.794) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Sophomore mean scores, therefore, differed significantly from freshman mean scores when they responded to this item.

Sophomore students (m 4.56) and junior students (m 4.47) achieved significantly greater means than freshmen students (m 3.92), and sophomore students (m 4.56) achieved significantly greater means than senior students (m 4.32) when they responded that a desire to achieve was a benefit gained from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=3.828) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Sophomore and junior mean scores, therefore, differed significantly from freshman mean scores, and sophomore mean scores differed significantly from senior mean scores when they responded to this item.

TABLE 26

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING BENEFITS GAINED FROM A RELATIONSHIP WITH THEIR MENTOR

ITEM VIII	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Self-esteem	Freshmen	12	3.5000	.6742	3.627	.0132
	Sophomore	78	4.2051	.7954	*	
	Junior	151	3.9272	.8801		
	Senior	130	4.1077	.9000		
	TOTAL	371	4.0350			
b. Courage.	Freshmen	12	3.1667	.7177	2.737	.0434
	Sophomore	78	3.8974	.8465	*	
	Junior	150	3.7867	.9092		
	Senior	129	3.8915	.8860		
	TOTAL	369	3.8266			
c. Determination	Freshmen	12	3.8333	.7177	1.794	.1478
	Sophomore	78	4.3462	.6412	*	
	Junior	152	4.3026	.8141		
	Senior	130	4.2231	.7901		
	TOTAL	372	4.2688			

ITEM VIII-a*(Gp 1 sign. diff. from Gps 2 & 4)
ITEM VIII-a*(Gp 3 sign. diff. from Gp 2)
ITEM VIII-b*(Gp 1 sign. diff. from Gps 2, 3 & 4)
ITEM VIII-c*(Gp 1 sign. diff. from Gp 2)

<.05 Level

TABLE 26 (continued)

ITEM VIII		GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
d.	A desire to achieve.	Freshmen	12	3.9167	.6686	3.828	.0101
		Sophomore	78	4.5641	.5487	*	
		Junior	152	4.4737	.7542		
		Senior	130	4.3231	.8280		
		TOTAL	372	4.4220			
e.	A desire to set goals for my future.	Freshmen	12	3.9167	.9003	1.375	.2502
		Sophomore	78	4.4103	.7105		
		Junior	152	4.3684	.7947		
		Senior	127	4.3307	.8457		
		TOTAL	369	4.3496			
f.	Academic growth.	Freshmen	12	3.9167	.7930	.539	.6559
		Sophomore	78	4.2051	.6715		
		Junior	152	4.1250	.8324		
		Senior	130	4.1615	.7954		
		TOTAL	372	4.1478			

ITEM VIII-d*(Gp 1 sign. diff. from Gps 2 & 3) < .05 Level
ITEM VIII-d*(Gp 4 sign. diff. from Gp. 2)

Table 27

An inspection of Table 27 showed a summary of means of the classification groups when they identified the qualities a mentor needs to exhibit. The data showed no two groups to be significantly different. Therefore freshman, sophomore, junior and senior mean scores did not differ significantly when they responded to this item (ten items listed).

TABLE 27

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING QUALITIES A MENTOR NEEDS TO EXHIBIT

ITEM IX	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Concern about my academic performance.	Freshmen	12	4.3333	.6513	.920	.4313
	Sophomore	78	4.4744	.9077		
	Junior	152	4.2434	1.1039		
	Senior	129	4.3178	.9436		
	TOTAL	371	4.3208			
b. Willingness to make constructive suggestions.	Freshmen	12	4.5000	.5222	.427	.7340
	Sophomore	78	4.3846	.9834		
	Junior	152	4.2829	1.0061		
	Senior	129	4.2636	.9962		
	TOTAL	371	4.3046			
c. Accessible to help.	Freshmen	12	4.5000	.5222	.883	.4499
	Sophomore	78	4.3846	1.0094		
	Junior	152	4.1908	1.0531		
	Senior	128	4.2500	.9557		
	TOTAL	370	4.2622			
d. Provide moral support.	Freshmen	12	4.4167	.5149	.803	.4928
	Sophomore	78	4.3077	1.0358		
	Junior	152	4.1184	1.0606		
	Senior	128	4.1953	.9725		
	TOTAL	370	4.1946			

TABLE 27 (continued)

ITEM IX	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e. Show interest in my professional growth.	Freshmen	12	4.5833	.5149	.645	.5867
	Sophomore	78	4.3462	1.0298		
	Junior	152	4.2303	1.0640		
	Senior	129	4.2326	1.0194		
	TOTAL	371	4.2668			
f. Capacity to establish connections for me.	Freshmen	12	4.5000	.6742	1.529	.2066
	Sophomore	78	3.9103	1.1863		
	Junior	152	3.8355	1.0762		
	Senior	127	3.8110	1.0891		
	TOTAL	369	3.8645			
g. Willingness for mutual trust.	Freshmen	12	4.5000	.6742	.416	.7418
	Sophomore	78	4.2821	1.0432		
	Junior	151	4.2119	1.1231		
	Senior	127	4.1890	.9573		
	TOTAL	368	4.2283			
h. Open mindedness.	Freshmen	12	4.3333	.7785	.007	.9992
	Sophomore	78	4.3205	1.0506		
	Junior	152	4.3289	1.0084		
	Senior	125	4.3120	1.0114		
	TOTAL	367	4.3215			

TABLE 27 (continued)

ITEM IX	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
i. Personifies good teaching.	Freshmen	10	4.2000	.6325	.183	.9095
	Sophomore	68	4.2206	1.1042		
	Junior	147	4.1156	1.0502		
	Senior	110	4.1818	1.0682		
	TOTAL	335	4.1612			
j. Easy to get along with.	Freshmen	10	4.3000	.6749	4.95	.6857
	Sophomore	68	4.4118	.9342		
	Junior	146	4.2466	1.0541		
	Senior	110	4.2364	1.0573		
	TOTAL					

Table 28

An inspection of Table 28 showed a summary of the means for four classification groups when they responded to the quality of their ideal mentor. The data showed no significant difference in means when all groups responded to this item. Freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior mean scores did not differ significantly when they responded to the four items in this table.

TABLE 28

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING SIGNIFICANT QUALITIES OF THEIR IDEAL MENTOR

ITEM X	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Strong self-concept.	Freshmen	12	4.5000	.5222	.695	.5556
	Sophomore	76	4.4605	.8073		
	Junior	147	4.4354	.6730		
	Senior	129	4.5504	.6119		
	TOTAL	364	4.4835			
b. Experiences worth sharing.	Freshmen	12	4.5833	.5149	.407	.7482
	Sophomore	77	4.3766	.8278		
	Junior	146	4.3630	.7035		
	Senior	129	4.3411	.7234		
	TOTAL	364	4.3654			
c. Openness	Freshmen	12	4.5000	.5222	1.467	.2233
	Sophomore	76	4.5658	.6600		
	Junior	147	4.3946	.7545		
	Senior	129	4.3643	.6839		
	TOTAL	364	4.4231			
d. Foresight	Freshmen	12	4.5000	.5222	.899	.4419
	Sophomore	75	4.4400	.6826		
	Junior	147	4.3401	.7719		
	Senior	129	4.2868	.6981		
	TOTAL	363	4.3471			

201

202

Table 29

An inspection of Table 29 showed a summary of the means for the classification groups of students when they identified negative outcomes from their mentor relationship. The data gathered showed that no two groups were significantly different when they responded to this item. The mean scores for freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors, therefore, did not differ significantly when they responded to this item.

TABLE 29

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING NEGATIVE OUTCOMES FROM THEIR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

ITEM XI	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Mentor withdrawal from the relationship.	Freshmen	12	1.5833	.7930	.518	.6703
	Sophomore	76	1.8947	1.1953		
	Junior	144	1.7917	1.0895		
	Senior	125	1.7280	1.0190		
	TOTAL	357	1.7843			
b. Mentor jealous of protege'.	Freshmen	12	1.5833	.7930	.485	.6930
	Sophomore	76	1.6184	1.1543		
	Junior	147	1.4830	.9605		
	Senior	126	1.4603	.8732		
	TOTAL	361	1.5069			
c. Mentor removed himself/herself from the area.	Freshmen	12	1.5000	.7977	.284	.8370
	Sophomore	76	1.8026	1.2439		
	Junior	145	1.7103	1.1113		
	Senior	123	1.7398	1.1223		
	TOTAL	356	1.7331			
d. Protege' lost communication with mentor.	Freshmen	12	1.7500	.9653	.193	.9012
	Sophomore	76	1.9737	1.2540		
	Junior	145	1.9724	1.2580		
	Senior	125	2.0240	1.2212		
	TOTAL	358	1.9832			

TABLE 29 (continued)

ITEM XI		GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e.	Mentor became too involved in personal functions to give the necessary time.	Freshmen	12	1.7500	.8660	.813	.4874
		Sophomore	76	1.9342	1.2789		
		Junior	146	1.7192	.9737		
		Senior	123	1.7154	1.0521		
		TOTAL	357	1.7647			
f.	Mentor as "mother hen" to protege' (dependency).	Freshmen	12	1.5833	.9962	.533	.6598
		Sophomore	75	1.8533	1.2808		
		Junior	146	1.7671	1.1144		
		Senior	124	1.6694	1.0018		
		TOTAL	357	1.7451			
g.	Mentor and protege' acting as buddies.	Freshmen	11	2.2727	1.1037	.316	.8142
		Sophomore	75	1.9600	1.2886		
		Junior	143	1.9510	1.1279		
		Senior	121	2.0248	1.1652		
		TOTAL	350	1.9886			
h.	Death of mentor.	Freshmen	12	1.2500	.6216	1.034	.3775
		Sophomore	76	1.4868	1.0770		
		Junior	144	1.2708	.7864		
		Senior	119	1.3782	.9387		
		TOTAL	351	1.3533			

TABLE 29 (continued)

ITEM XI	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
1. Illness of mentor.	Freshmen	12	1.4167	.7930	.642	.5882
	Sophomore	76	1.5132	1.0893		
	Junior	144	1.3333	.8610		
	Senior	119	1.4286	.9346		
	TOTAL	351	1.4074			

Table 30

An inspection of Table 30 showed a summary of the means for the classification groups of students when they identified their grade point average. The data showed no significant difference among or between the means. The mean scores for freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors did not differ significantly when they responded to this item.

TABLE 30

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG STUDENTS RESPONSES BY CLASSIFICATION WHEN IDENTIFYING THEIR GRADE POINT AVERAGE

ITEM XII	GROUP	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
What is your Grade Point Average?	Freshmen	22	2.8764	.3545	.674	.5682
	Sophomore	104	2.8307	.5508		
	Junior	210	2.8915	.4254		
	Senior	158	2.9147	.4979		
	TOTAL	494	2.8854			

Table 31

An inspection of Table 31 showed a summary of means for 10 (ten) schools and colleges when their students responded to reasons why they did not have a mentor at FAMU. Students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.59) achieved significantly greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 2.68) when they responded that no one seemed to take an interest in them. An F ratio (F=1.024) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Arts and Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from those in Pharmacy when they responded to this item.

Students in Education (m 4.07) achieved greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 3.09) when they responded that they found their advisor to be conceited. An F ratio (F=1.156) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Therefore, students in Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those in in Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.44) achieved greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 2.27), students in Business and Industry (m 2.50), students in Education (m 2.67) and students in Pharmacy (m 2.73) when they responded that they found their advisor to be preoccupied most of the time. An F ratio (F=2.422) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Arts and Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from students in Allied Health Sciences, Business and Industry, Education, and Pharmacy when they responded to this item.

Students in Nursing (m 4.50), students in Engineering (m 3.90), students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.85), students in Architecture (m 3.82) students in Education (m 3.80), and students in Business and Industry (m 3.61) achieved greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 2.72), when they responded that their professors were conceited. Students in Nursing (m 4.50) achieved greater means than students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 3.10), when they responded that their professors were conceited. An F ratio (F=2.94) was computed at $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Nursing, Architecture, Engineering, Arts and Sciences and Business and Industry had mean scores which differed significantly from students in Pharmacy, and Students in Nursing had mean scores which differed significantly from students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering (m 3.50) achieved greater means than students in Architecture (m 3.45), Arts and Sciences (m 3.37) and Pharmacy (m 2.38) when they responded that they found their professors to be preoccupied most of the time. An F ratio (F=1.609) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Mean scores for students in Engineering differed from students in Architecture, Arts and Sciences, and Pharmacy when they responded to this item.

Students in Nursing (m 4.17), and students in Arts and Sciences (M 3.96) achieved greater means than students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 3.10) when they responded that they found their university Chaplain to be conceited. Student Arts and Sciences (m

3.93) achieved greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 3.23) when they responded that they found the Chaplain to be conceited. Students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.96) achieved greater means than students in Business and Industry (m 3.34) when they found the Chaplain to be conceited. An F ratio (F=2.26) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Nursing and Arts and Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from students in Pharmacy and Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, and students in Business and Industry earned mean scores which differed significantly from the students in Business and Industry when they responded to this item.

Student in Nursing (m 4.17) achieved greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 3.10) when they responded that they found the Chaplain preoccupied most of the time. Students in Nursing (m 4.17) and students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.77) achieved greater means than students in Business and Industry (m 3.29) when they also responded that they found the Chaplain to be preoccupied most of the time. An F ratio (F=1.80) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Nursing had mean scores that differed significantly from students in Allied Health Sciences, Arts and Sciences, and Business and Industry when they responded to this item.

Students in Nursing (m 1.131) achieved greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 2.75), students n Allied Health Sciences (m 2.86), students in Architecture (m 3.38), students in Business and Industry (m 3.45), students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 3.50), students in Journalism (m 3.50), students in Arts and Sciences (m

3.53), students in Education (m 3.57) and students in Engineering (m 4.00), when they responded that their peers were preoccupied most of the time. An F ratio (F=1.32) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Mean scores for students in Nursing differed significantly from the students in Education, Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy, Engineering, Journalism, Architecture, and Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Nursing (m 5.00) achieved greater means than students in Architecture (m 3.36), students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 3.60), students in Business and Industry (m 3.66), and students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.89) when they responded that they are loners and had avoided a mentoring relationship. An F ratio (F=1.46) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Therefore, students in Nursing earned mean scores that differed significantly from students in Architecture, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Business and Industry, and Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

TABLE 31

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED REASON FOR NOT DEVELOPING A MENTOR RELATIONSHIP AT FAMU

ITEM II	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. No one seemed to take an interest in me.	Education	15	3.3333	1.4475	1.024	.4235
	Business & Industry	41	3.1951	1.0055		
	Arts & Sciences	27	3.5926	1.2484		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.5000	1.5092		
	Pharmacy	22	2.6818	.9455		
	Engineering	10	3.2000	1.0328		
	Journalism	8	3.1250	1.3562		
	Architecture	11	3.2727	.9045		
	Nursing	6	3.5000	.8367		
	Allied Health Sciences	11	3.4545	1.2136		
	Total	161	3.2547			
b. I do not have an outgoing personality.	Education	15	3.60000	1.2421	1.037	.4136
	Business & Industry	41	3.5366	1.3057		
	Arts & Sciences	27	4.0000	1.2403		
	Engi. Sci., Tech, Agri.	10	3.6000	1.3499		
	Pharmacy	22	4.0909	1.0650		
	Engineering	10	3.9000	.8756		
	Journalism	7	4.2857	.7559		
	Architecture	11	3.9091	1.1362		
	Nursing	6	4.6667	.5164		
	Allied Health Sciences	11	3.9091	1.1362		
	Total	160	3.8500			

TABLE 31 (continued)

ITEM II	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
c. I have found most of the advisors in my field to be conceited.	Education	15	4.0667	.7988	1.156*	.3271
	Business & Industry	40	3.3750	1.0786		
	Arts & Sciences	28	3.6786	1.0560		
	Engi. Sci. Tech., Agri	10	3.5000	1.5811		
	Pharmacy	22	3.3636	1.0022		
	Engineering	10	3.7000	.9487		
	Journalism	7	3.4286	.7868		
	Architecture	11	3.8182	.8739		
	Nursing	6	4.0000	.6325		
	Allied Health Sciences	11	3.0909	1.0445		
	Total	160	3.5562			
d. I have found most of the advisors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.	Education	15	2.6667	1.2910	2.422	.0134
	Business & Industry	42	2.5000	.9690		
	Arts & Sciences	27	3.4444	1.0860		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.2000	1.3984		
	Pharmacy	22	2.7273	.9351		
	Engineering	10	3.3000	1.1595		
	Journalism	7	3.1429	.6901		
	Architecture	11	3.0909	1.0445		
	Nursing	6	3.0000	.8944		
	Allied Health Sciences	11	3.3636	1.3618		
	Total	160	3.5500			

ITEM II-c.*(Gp 10 sign diff from Gp 1) < .05 Level
ITEM II-d.*(10, 2, 1 & 5 sign diff from 3)

TABLE 31 (continued)

	ITEM II	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e.	I have found most of the professors in my field to be conceited.	Education	15	3.8000	1.0823	2.9444	.0030
		Business & Industry	41	3.6098	.9186		
		Arts & Sciences	27	3.8519	.8182		
		Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.1000	1.5951		
		Pharmacy	22	2.7273	1.3159		
		Engineering	10	3.9000	.5676		
		Journalism	7	3.2857	.9512		
		Architecture	11	3.8182	.8739		
		Nursing	6	4.5000	.5477		
		Allied Health Sciences	11	3.3636	1.3618		
		Total	160	3.5500			
f.	I have found mot of the professors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.	Education	15	3.1333	1.1872		
		Business & Industry	42	2.9048	.9579		
		Arts & Sciences	27	3.3704	1.2755		
		Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.2000	1.3984		
		Pharmacy	21	2.3810	1.1170		
		Engineering	10	3.5000	1.0801		
		Journalism	7	3.2857	.7559		
		Architecture	11	3.4545	1.2136		
		Nursing	6	3.1667	.9832		
		Allied Health Sciences	11	2.8182	1.1677		
		Total	160	3.0500			

ITEM II-e.*(5 sign diff from 2, 1, 8, 3, 6 & 9) - *(Gp 4 is sign diff from Gp 9) < .05 Level

TABLE 31 (continued)

	ITEM II	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
g.	I have found most of the University administrators to be conceited.	Education	15	3.2000	1.3202	.775	.6393
		Business & Industry	39	3.3846	.7819		
		Arts & Sciences	27	3.2593	1.1633		
		Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.0000	1.1547		
		Pharmacy	22	2.9091	1.1916		
		Engineering	10	3.5000	1.0801		
		Journalism	7	3.5714	.9759		
		Architecture	11	3.2727	1.1909		
		Nursing	5	4.0000	.7071		
		Allied Health Sciences	11	3.4545	1.3685		
		Total	157	3.2866			
h.	I have found most of the University administrators to be preoccupied most of the time.	Education	15	2.4667	1.3020	.724	.6866
		Business & Industry	41	2.4878	1.0277		
		Arts & Sciences	26	2.9615	1.3995		
		Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.0000	1.0541		
		Pharmacy	22	2.6364	1.1770		
		Engineering	10	2.80000	1.2293		
		Journalism	7	3.0000	1.0000		
		Architecture	11	3.0909	1.4460		
		Nursing	6	3.1667	1.1690		
		Allied Health Sciences	11	2.5455	1.0357		
		Total	159	2.7296			

TABLE 31 (continued)

ITEM II	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
i. I found the Chaplain to be conceited.	Education	15	3.6667	.8997	2.257	.0214
	Business & Industry	41	3.3415	.6932		
	Arts & Sciences	27	3.9630	.8979		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.1000	1.1005		
	Pharmacy	22	3.2273	.8691		
	Engineering	10	3.7000	.8233		
	Journalism	7	3.1429	.3780		
	Architecture	11	3.3636	.6742		
	Nursing	6	4.1667	.9832		
	Allied Health Sciences	9	3.4444	1.2360		
	Total	158	3.5000			
j. I have found the Chaplain to be preoccupied most of the time.	Education	15	3.667	.8997	1.808	.0712
	Business & Industry	41	3.2927	.6420		
	Arts & Sciences	26	3.7692	.8629		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.2000	.9189		
	Pharmacy	22	3.3636	.7267		
	Engineering	10	3.7000	.8233		
	Journalism	7	3.2857	.7559		
	Architecture	11	3.2727	.7862		
	Nursing	6	4.1667	.9732		
	Allied Health Sciences	10	3.1000	1.1005		
	Total	158	3.4557			

ITEM II-i.*(Gp 4 sign diff from GPs 3 & 9)   ITEM II-i.*(Gp 2 sign diff from Gp 3)
ITEM II-i.*(Gp 5 sign diff from GPs 3 & 9)   < .05 Level
ITEM II-j.*(GP 10 sign diff from Gp 9) & *(Gp 2 sign diff from Gps 3 & 9)

225
226

TABLE 31 (continued)

ITEM II	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
k. I have found my peers to be conceited.	Education	15	3.6000	1.2421	.887	.5389
	Business and Industry	41	3.0488	1.1608		
	Arts & Sciences	28	3.5357	1.4006		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.4000	1.2649		
	Pharmacy	22	3.0000	1.2724		
	Engineering	10	3.5000	1.1785		
	Journalism	7	3.4286	.9759		
	Architecture	10	3.9000	.7379		
	Nursing	6	3.5000	1.3784		
	Allied Health Sciences	10	3.5000	1.2693		
	Total	159	3.3459			
l. I have found my peers to be preoccupied most of the time.	Education	7	3.5714	.9759	1.312	.2459
	Business and Industry	23	3.4348	.8959		
	Arts & Sciences	15	3.5333	1.1872		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	4	3.5000	1.2910		
	Pharmacy	12	2.75000	.9653		
	Engineering	4	4.0000	0		
	Journalism	2	3.5000	.7071		
	Architecture	8	3.3750	1.0607		
	Nursing	1	5.0000	0		
	Allied Health Sciences	7	2.8571	.8997		
	Total	83	3.3614			

TABLE 31 (continued)

ITEM II	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
m. I am a longer; therefore, I avoided the mentoring relationship.	Education	15	3.8000	1.0823	1.464	.1662
	Business and Industry	41	3.6585	1.1093		
	Arts & Sciences	27	3.8889	1.1875		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	10	3.6000	1.4298		
	Pharmacy	22	4.1364	1.0821		
	Engineering	10	4.0000	.9428		
	Journalism	7	3.8571	1.2150		
	Architecture	11	3.3636	1.0269		
	Nursing	6	5.0000	0		
	Allied Health Sciences	10	4.2000	.9189		
	Total	159	3.8679			

ITEM II-m.*(Gp 8 sign diff from Gp 9) < .05 Level
*(Gp 4 sign diff from GP 9)
*(Gp 2 sign diff from GP 9)
*(Gp 3 sign diff from Gp 9)

Table 32

An inspection of Table 32 showed a summary of the means of 10 schools and colleges when they indicated the behaviors exhibited by their mentors. The data showed that students in Architecture (m 2.06) achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.56); students in Pharmacy (m 2.08) greater means than students in Business and Industry (m 1.62); and students in Pharmacy (m 2.08) achieved significantly greater means than students in Education (m 1.71) when they responded that their mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel them about personal concerns. An F ratio (F=1.91) was computed at the $<$ .05 level of significance. Students in Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture, Journalism, Business and Industry, and Education when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.06) and students in Arts and Sciences (m 1.73) achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.38); and students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.07) achieved greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.62) when they responded that their mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel them about professional concerns. An F ratio (F=1.457) was computed at the $<$.05 level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences, Journalism, Allied Health and Sciences, and Business and Industry when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 2.82), students in Pharmacy (m 2.68),

Table 32

An inspection of Table 32 showed a summary of the means of 10 schools and colleges when they indicated the behaviors exhibited by their mentors. The data showed that students in Architecture (m 2.06) achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.56); students in Pharmacy (m 2.08) greater means than students in Business and Industry (m 1.62); and students in Pharmacy (m 2.08) achieved significantly greater means than students in Education (m 1.71) when they responded that their mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel them about personal concerns. An F ratio (F=1.91) was computed at the $<$ .05 level of significance. Students in Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture, Journalism, Business and Industry, and Education when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.06) and students in Arts and Sciences (m 1.73) achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.38); and students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.07) achieved greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.62) when they responded that their mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel them about professional concerns. An F ratio (F=1.457) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences, Journalism, Allied Health and Sciences, and Business and Industry when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 2.82), students in Pharmacy (m 2.68),

Table 32

An inspection of Table 32 showed a summary of the means of 10 schools and colleges when they indicated the behaviors exhibited by their mentors. The data showed that students in Architecture (m 2.06) achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.56); students in Pharmacy (m 2.08) greater means than students in Business and Industry (m 1.62); and students in Pharmacy (m 2.08) achieved significantly greater means than students in Education (m 1.71) when they responded that their mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel them about personal concerns. An F ratio (F=1.91) was computed at the $<$ .05 level of significance. Students in Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture, Journalism, Business and Industry, and Education when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.06) and students in Arts and Sciences (m 1.73) achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.38); and students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.07) achieved greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.62) when they responded that their mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel them about professional concerns. An F ratio (F=1.457) was computed at the $<$.05 level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences, Journalism, Allied Health and Sciences, and Business and Industry when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 2.82), students in Pharmacy (m 2.68),

students in Arts and Sciences (m 2.37) achieved greater means than students in Education (m 1.95), students in Architecture (m 2.82), and students in Pharmacy (m 2.68) achieved greater means than students in Engineering (m 2.00); students in Architecture (m 2.82), and students in Pharmacy (m 2.68) achieved significantly greater means than students in Nursing (m 2.06); students in Architecture (m 2.82), and students in Pharmacy (m 2.68) achieved greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 2.12) when they responded to my mentor teaches me how to use various interpersonal techniques (e.g., how to get along with others); students in Arts and Sciences (m 2.00) achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.59). An F ratio (F=3.127) was computed at $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Architecture mean scores different significantly from students in Education, Arts and Sciences, Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences mean scores, when they responded to this item.

Students in Arts and Sciences (m 2.00) achieved greater means than students in Business and Industry (M 1.62), students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.65), and students in Education (m 1.68), when they responded that their mentor believes in them and supports them as a candidate for a future position. An F ratio (F=1.601) was computed at $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Arts and Sciences and students in Business and Industry mean scores differed significantly from students in Journalism mean scores; students in Arts and Sciences mean scores differed significantly from students in Allied Health Sciences mean scores, and students in Education means scores, when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Science, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.00), students in Pharmacy (m 1.94), students in Arts and Sciences (m 1.83), and students in Business and Industry (m 1.79) achieved greater means than students in Engineering (m 1.35) when they responded that their mentor challenges, encourages, and assists them in improving the skills necessary to operate successfully in their field or area of concentration. An F ratio (F=1.804) was computed at the $<$.05 level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture, Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, and Pharmacy. Students in Pharmacy earned mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Journalism when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Science, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.20), students in Architecture (m 2.59), students in Pharmacy (m 2.05), and students in Arts and Sciences (m 1.92) achieved greater means than students in Engineering (m 1.43) when they responded that their mentor exemplifies the essence of the professional qualities towards which they aspire. An F ratio (F=2.825) was computed at the $<$.05 level of significance. Students in Engineering Science and Technology and Agriculture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Pharmacy, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Journalism, Architecture, Nursing and Education when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 2.71) achieved greater means than students in Nursing (m 1.94), students in Education (m 1.96), students in Engineering (m 2.00), and students in Allied Health Sciences (m 2.02) when they responded that their mentor's coaching helped them to improve their overall grade point average (GPA). An F ratio (F=1.519) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education, Engineering, Nursing and Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 2.31) students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.29), and students in Arts and Sciences (m 2.02), achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.61); students in Architecture (m 2.31), students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.29), and students in Pharmacy (m 2.19) achieved greater means than students in Nursing (m 1.72); students in Architecture (m 2.31), Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.29), and Pharmacy (m 2.19) achieved greater means than students in Education (m 1.81) when they responded that my mentor helped me to achieve my professional objectives. An F ratio (F=3.119) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education, Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, and Nursing when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 3.00) achieved greater means than students in Education (m 2.16), Business and Industry (m 2.23), Arts and Sciences (m 2.34), Pharmacy (m 2.51), Journalism (m 2.09), Nursing (m 2.22) and Allied Health Sciences (m 2.31) when they responded that their mentor introduced them to influential people and informed them of opportunities which might enhance their careers. An F ratio (F=3.326) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education, Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy, Engineering, Journalism, and Nursing and Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.17) achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 2.41), Allied Health Sciences (m 2.60), and Education (m 2.75) when they responded that their mentor stood up for them and defended them against others, even though they had made an error. An F ratio (F=1.778) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Arts and Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education, Journalism, Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 2.12), Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.07), Pharmacy (m 2.03), and Arts and Sciences (m 1.81) achieved greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.47); students in Architecture (m 1.12), Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.07), and Pharmacy (m 2.03) achieved greater means than students in Business and Industry (m 1.59), students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.62), and students in Education (m 1.64) when they responded that their mentor is recognized as a person with good ideas who gets positive results with the projects he/she undertakes. An F ratio (F=3.049) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in

Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education, Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy, Engineering, Journalism, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

TABLE 32

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED BEHAVIORS EXHIBITED BY THEIR MENTOR

ITEM IV	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about personal concerns.	Education	77	1.7143	.7584	1.913	.0489
	Business and Industry	47	1.6170	.7676		
	Arts & Sciences	59	1.7797	.5592		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.0000	.8452	*	
	Pharmacy	37	2.0811	.6823		
	Engineering	23	1.6957	.7029		
	Journalism	32	1.5625	.6690		
	Architecture	18	2.0556	.8024		
	Nursing	18	8333	.9235		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	1.8077	.6579		
	Total	378	1.7804			
b. My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about professional concerns.	Education	77	1.6883	.6932	1.457	.1623
	Business and Industry	47	1.6170	.7087		
	Arts & Sciences	59	1.7288	.7618	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.0667	.8837		
	Pharmacy	37	1.7297	.6519		
	Engineering	23	1.6087	.7827		
	Journalism	32	1.3750	.4919		
	Architecture	16	1.7500	.6831		
	Nursing	18	1.6111	.5016		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	1.6154	.5655		
	Total	376	1.6622			

ITEM IV - a.*(Gp 7 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) - *(Gp 2 sign diff from GP 5) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 5)
ITEM IV - b.*(Gp 7 sign diff from GPs 3 & 4) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gp 4) - *(Gp 2 sign diff from GP 4)
$<$.05 Level

TABLE 32 (continued)

ITEM IV	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
c. My mentor teaches me how to use various inter-personal techniques, e.g. how to get along with others.	Education	77	1.9481	.9017	3.127	.0012
	Business and Industry	47	2.2979	1.0818		
	Arts & Sciences	59	2.3729	.8489		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.4667	1.0601		
	Pharmacy	37	2.6757	.9145	*	
	Engineering	23	2.0000	.9535		
	Jounralism	32	2.2500	.9504		
	Architecture	17	2.8235	.9510		
	Nursing	18	2.0556	.8024		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	2.1154	.8553		
	Total	377	2.2467			
d. My mentor believes in me and wholeheartedly supports me as a candidate for a future position in my field.	Education	77	1.6753	.7153	1.601	.1131
	Business and Industry	47	1.6170	.6445		
	Arts & Sciences	59	2.0000	.9469		
	Engi. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.0000	.8452		
	Pharmacy	37	1.8378	.7643		
	Engineering	23	1.6522	.7751		
	Journalism	32	1.5938	.6148		
	Architecture	17	1.8824	.6966		
	Nursing	18	1.6667	.5941		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	1.6538	.7108		
	Total	377	1.7454			

ITEM IV - c.*(Gp 1 sign diff from Gps 3, 5, & 8) - *(GP 6 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) -
*(GP 9 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) < .05 Level
ITEM IV - d.*(Gp 7 sign diff from Gp 3) - *(Gp 2 sign diff from Gp 3) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gp 3) -
*(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 3)

TABLE 32 (continued)

ITEM IV		GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e.	My mentor challenges, encourages, and assists me in improving the skills necessary to operate successfully in my field or area of concentration.	Education	77	1.6883	.7824	1.804	.0661
		Business and Industry	47	1.7872	.7784		
		Arts & Sciences	59	1.8305	.8935		
		Eng. Sci. Tech, Agri.	15	2.0000	.8452	*	
		Pharmacy	36	1.9444	.7149		
		Engineering	23	1.3478	.5728		
		Journalism	32	1.5000	.5080		
		Architecture	17	1.8235	.7276		
		Nursing	18	1.6667	.5941		
		Allied Health Sciences	51	1.7059	.6721		
		Total	375	1.7307			
f.	My mentor exemplifies the essence of the professional qualities toward which I aspire.	Education	76	1.6974	.7663	2.825	.0032
		Business and Industry	46	1.7609	.8481		
		Arts & Sciences	59	1.9153	.7494		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.2000	1.0142		
		Pharmacy	37	2.0541	.7798	*	
		Engineering	23	1.4348	.5898		
		Journalism	32	1.5313	.6214		
		Architecture	17	2.0588	.5557		
		Nursing	18	1.5556	.5113		
		Allied Health Sciences	51	1.7255	.7504		
		Total	374	1.7781			

ITEM IV - e.*(Gp 6 sign diff from Gps 2, 3, 5 & 8) - *(Gp 7 sign diff from Gp 5) < .05 Level
ITEM IV - f.*(Gp 6 sign diff from Gps 3, 4, 5 & 8) - *(Gp 7 sign diff from Gps 3, 4, 5 8) -
*(Gp 9 sign diff from Gps 4 & 5) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gps 4 & 5)

TABLE 32 (continued)

ITEM IV	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
g. My mentor's coaching helps me to improve my overall GPA (Grade Point Average).	Education	76	1.9605	.8397	1.519	.1391
	Business and Industry	47	2.2766	1.0151		
	Arts & Sciences	59	2.1695	1.0197	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.3333	.9759		
	Pharmacy	36	2.1944	.8886		
	Engineering	23	2.0000	.9045		
	Journalism	32	2.1563	.9541		
	Architecture	17	2.7059	.5879		
	Nursing	18	1.9444	.8024		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	2.0192	.8743		
	Total	375	2.1307			
h. My mentor helps me to achieve my professional objectives.	Education	77	1.8052	.6890	3.119	.0012
	Business and Industry	47	1.8936	.6336		
	Arts & Sciences	59	2.0169	.6295		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	2.2857	.9945		
	Pharmacy	37	2.1892	.8110		
	Engineering	23	1.7391	.6192		
	Journalism	31	1.6129	.5584		
	Architecture	16	2.3125	.7042		
	Nursing	18	1.7222	.5745		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	1.9231	.6816		
	Total	374	1.9198			

ITEM IV - g.*(Gp 9 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 6 sign diff from Gp 8)
*(Gp 10 sign diff from Gp 8)

ITEM IV - h.*(Gp 7 sign diff from Gps 3, 4, 5 & 8) - *(Gp 9 sign diff from Gps 4, 5 & 8) -
*(Gp 6 sign diff from GPs 4, 5 & 8) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gps 4, 5 & 8) <.05 Level

TABLE 32 (continued)

ITEM IV		GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
i.	My mentor introduces me to influential people and informs me of opportunities which may further my career.	Education	77	2.1558	.8439	3.326	.0006
		Business and Industry	47	2.2340	1.0470	*	
		Arts & Sciences	58	2.3448	1.0183		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	2.1429	.9493		
		Pharmacy	37	2.5135	.9013		
		Engineering	23	1.5217	.7305		
		Journalism	32	2.0938	1.0883		
		Architecture	17	3.0000	.8660		
		Nursing	18	2.2222	.9428		
		Allied Health Sciences	52	2.3077	.9401		
		Total	375	2.2480			
j.	My mentor stands up for me and defends me against others, even though I may have made an error.	Education	77	2.7532	1.0280	1.779	.0707
		Business and Industry	47	2.7660	1.2720	*	
		Arts & Sciences	59	3.1695	.9313		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.6000	.9856		
		Pharmacy	36	2.9167	.9673		
		Engineering	23	2.7826	1.0426		
		Journalism	32	2.4688	.9832		
		Architecture	17	3.0588	1.1974		
		Nursing	18	2.7222	.8264		
		Allied Health Sciences	52	2.5962	.7985		
		Total	376	2.7979			

ITEM IV - i*(Gp 6 sign diff from Gps 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 & 10) - *(Gp 7 sign diff from Gp 8) - < .05 Level
*(Gp 4 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 9 sign diff from Gp 8)
*(Gp 2 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gp 8)
ITEM IV - j*(Gp 7 sign diff from Gp 3) - *(Gp 4 sign diff from Gp 3) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 3) < .05 Level
*(Gp 10 sign from Gp 3) - (Gp 9 sign diff from Gp 3)

TABLE 32 (continued)

	ITEM IV	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
k.	My mentor is recognized as a person with good ideas who gets positive results with the projects he/she undertakes.	Education	77	1.6364	.6865	3.049	.0016
		Business and Industry	47	1.5957	.6481		
		Arts & Sciences	59	1.8136	.6290	*	
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.0667	.8837		
		Pharmacy	37	2.0270	.7988		
		Engineering	23	1.6522	.8847		
		Journalism	32	1.4688	.6214		
		Architecture	17	2.1176	.6002		
		Nursing	18	1.6667	.5941		
		Allied Health Sciences	52	1.6154	.5297		
		Total	377	1.7215			
l.	My mentor is sensitive to the experiences that I brought to FAMU.	Education	77	2.0260	.8580	.704	.7051
		Business and Industry	46	1.9130	.8387		
		Arts & Sciences	59	2.1356	.7759		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.3333	1.1127		
		Pharmacy	37	2.0811	.7593		
		Engineering	23	2.1739	.8341		
		Journalism	32	1.9375	1.0453		
		Architecture	17	2.2353	.6642		
		Nursing	18	2.1667	.5145		
		Allied Health Sciences	52	2.1538	.7511		
		Total	376	2.0824			

ITEM IV - k.*(Gp 7 sign diff from Gps 3, 4, 5 & 8) - *(Gp 2 sign diff from Gps 4, 5 & 8)
*(Gp 10 sign diff from Gps 4, 5 & 8) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gps 4, 5 & 8) <.05 Level

249

250

Table 33

An inspection of Table 33 showed a summary of means for the 10 (ten) colleges and schools when the student's responded by identifying their perceptions of hindering and helping behavior on the part of their mentor. Behaviors that hindered the development of a mentor relationship were identified by the following: students in Architecture (m 3.00) achieved greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 2.74) and Business and Industry (m 2.04) when they responded that moodiness on the part of their mentor hindered the development of the mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=1.881) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Business and Industry and Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Arts and Sciences (m 2.91) achieved greater means than students in Business and Industry (m 2.39) when they responded that moodiness on their part hindered their mentor-protege relationship. An F ratio (F=.892) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Arts and Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Business and Industry when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 3.06) achieved greater means than students in Engineering (m 2.78), Arts and Sciences (m 2.44), Allied Health Sciences (m 2.13), Pharmacy (m 2.23), Education (m 2.23), Journalism (m 2.25), Nursing (m 2.28), and Business and Industry (m 1.89) when they responded that the lack of punctual habits on the part of the mentor hindered their relationship. An F ratio (F=2.890) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education, Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, Pharmacy, Engineering, Journalism, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.14) achieved greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 1.84), Education (m 1.56), Journalism (m 1.56), Engineering (m 1.57), and Allied Health Sciences (m 1.67) when they responded that helpfulness on the part of the mentor facilitated the development of their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=1.824) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture mean scores differed significantly from students in Education, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Journalism, and Allied Health Sciences mean scores, when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture (m 2.29) achieved greater means than students in Education (m 1.83) when they responded to helpfulness on the part of themselves. An F ratio (F=1.190) was computed at $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering (m 2.30) achieved greater means than students in Education (m 1.82) when they responded that their mentor was open and willing to share problems and feelings. An F ratio (F-

1.586) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Engineering had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education when they responded to this item.

Students in Arts and Sciences (m 2.13) achieved greater means than students in Education (m 1.77) when they responded that availability of both mentor and protege helped the development of the relationship. An F ratio (F=1.617) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Arts and Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education when they responded to this item.

TABLE 33

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED THE EVENTS THAT HELPED OR HINDERED THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

ITEM V	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. THINGS THAT HINDERED THE RELATIONSHIP WERE:						
1. Moodiness on the part of the mentor.	Education	73	2.3699	1.0738	1.881	.0537
	Business and Industry	47	2.0426	1.1221		
	Arts & Sciences	55	2.7455	1.1092	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.5385	1.2659		
	Pharmacy	35	2.5143	1.0675		
	Engineering	23	2.6522	1.1912		
	Journalism	32	2.5938	1.2144		
	Architecture	17	3.0000	.8660		
	Nursing	18	2.3889	.9164		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	2.4038	.9953		
	TOTAL	365	2.4767			
2. Moodiness on the of the protege'.	Education	73	2,6849	1.0913	.892	.5328
	Business and Industry	46	2.3913	1.3246		
	Arts & Sciences	55	2.9091	1.0933	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.6154	1.0439		
	Pharmacy	34	2.8235	1.1138		
	Engineering	23	2.6957	.9740		
	Journalism	32	2.8438	1.1103		
	Architecture	17	3.0000	.7906		
	Nursing	18	2.6667	.9701		
	Allied Health Sciences	51	2.7843	1.0063		
	TOTAL	362	2.7348			

ITEM V - a.1*(Gp 2 sign diff from Gps 3 & 8)   ITEM V - a.2*(Gp 2 sign diff from Gp 3)   < .05 Level

TABLE 33 (continued)

ITEM V		GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
3.	Lack of punctual habits on the part of the mentor.	Education	73	2.2329	1.0995	2.890	.0026
		Business and Industry	47	1.8936	1.0051		
		Arts & Sciences	55	2.4364	.9768		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.3846	1.2609		
		Pharmacy	35	2.2286	.8774	*	
		Engineering	23	2.7826	.9514		
		Journalism	32	2.2500	1.0160		
		Architecture	16	3.0625	.8539		
		Nursing	18	2.2778	.8264		
		Allied Health Sciences	52	2.1346	.9081		
		TOTAL	364	2.2857			
4.	Lack of punctual habits on the part of the protege'.	Education	73	2.4110	.9977	1.282	.2450
		Business and Industry	46	2.1522	1.2287		
		Arts & Sciences	55	2.4727	.9200	*	
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.3846	1.0439		
		Pharmacy	34	2.4412	1.0207		
		Engineering	23	2.6087	.8913		
		Journalism	31	2.5806	1.1188		
		Architecture	16	2.9375	.6801		
		Nursing	18	2.6667	.9701		
		Allied Health Sciences	51	2.2745	.8736		
		TOTAL	360	2.4333			

ITEM V - a-3*(Gp 2 sign diff from Gps 3, 6 & 8) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from GPs 6 & 8) - *(Gp 5 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gps 6 & 8) - *(Gp 7 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 9 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gp 8). < .05 Level

ITEM V - a-4*(Gp 2 sign diff from Gp 8)

Table 34

An inspection of Table 34 showed a summary of the means for the ten (10) colleges and schools when the students responded by identifying events that led to the development of a mentor relationship at FAMU. The data showed that students in Business and Industry (m 2.85) achieved greater means than students in Education (m 2.32) and Arts and Sciences (m 2.34) when they identified the need for help in adjusting to their courses of study. An F ratio (F=1.089) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Therefore, students in Business and Industry had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education and Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 3.59) achieved significantly greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 3.16), Allied Health Sciences (m 3.15), Business and Industry (m 2.91), Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture (m 2.53), Engineering (m 2.65), Arts and Sciences (m 2.66), and Journalism (m 2.78); students in Allied Health Sciences (m 3.15) achieved significantly greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 2.66) when they responded that they needed help in determining if they were in the right field (career choice). An F ratio (F=3.302) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Pharmacy, Allied Health Sciences, Business and Industry, Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture, and Journalism; students in Allied Health Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Journalism (m 3.13) and students in Business and Industry (m 2.94) achieved significantly greater means than students in Nursing (m 2.00) and Arts and Sciences (m 2.43); students in Journalism (m 3.13) achieved significantly greater means than students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture (m 2.35), Allied Health Sciences (m 2.48), and Education (m 2.59) when they responded that they needed help in solving their study problems. An F ratio (F=2.444) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Journalism and Business and Industry had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Nursing and Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item; students in Journalism had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Engineering, Allied Health Sciences, and Education when they responded to this item.

Students in Allied Health Sciences (m 3.29) achieved significantly greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 3.08), Nursing (m 2.50), Education (m 2.60), and Arts and Sciences (m 2.74) when they responded that they needed advice concerning their financial problems (books, food, rent, car, etc.) An F ratio (F=1.904) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Allied Health Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Pharmacy, Nursing, Education, and Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

TABLE 34

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED THE EVENTS WHICH LED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP AT FAMU

ITEM VI	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. I needed help in adjusting to my courses of study.	Education	74	2.3243	1.0993	1.089	.3702
	Business and Industry	47	2.8511	1.1225		
	Arts and Sciences	58	2.3448	1.0009		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.7333	1.0328		
	Pharmacy	36	2.6111	1.1778	*	
	Engineering	23	2.6522	1.0273		
	Journalism	32	2.6875	1.3060		
	Architecture	17	2.5294	1.1789		
	Nursing	18	2.4444	1.2472		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	2.5385	1.0377		
	TOTAL	372	2.5349			
b. I needed help to determine if I was in the right field, i.e., career choice.	Education	74	2.3649	1.1654	3.302	.0007
	Business and Industry	47	2.9149	1.1388		
	Arts and Sciences	58	2.6552	1.0354		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.5333	1.2459		
	Pharmacy	37	3.1622	1.0142	*	
	Engineering	23	2.6522	1.0273		
	Journalism	32	2.7813	1.3133		
	Architecture	17	3.5882	1.1757		
	Nursing	18	2.8889	1.0226		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	3.1538	1.3044		
	TOTAL	373	2.8097			

ITEM VI - a.*(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 2) - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gp 2)
ITEM VI - b.*(Gp 1 sign diff from Gps 2, 10, 5 & 8) - *(Gp 4 sign diff from Gp 8) -
*(Gp 6 sign diff from Gp 8 - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 7 sign diff from Gp 8)

TABLE 34 (continued)

ITEM VI	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
c. I needed help in solving my study problems.	Education	73	2.5890	1.1999	2.444	.0104
	Business and Industry	47	2.9362	1.2407		
	Arts & Sciences	58	2.4310	.9753	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	2.8000	1.2649		
	Pharmacy	37	2.5946	1.0127		
	Engineering	23	2.3478	1.0706		
	Journalism	32	3.1250	1.1570		
	Architecture	17	2.7059	.6860		
	Nursing	18	2.0000	.6860		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	2.4808	.9391		
	TOTAL	372	2.6102			
d. I needed advice concerning my financial problems (books, food, rent, car, etc.).	Education	75	2.6000	1.2520	1.904	.5002
	Business and Industry	47	2.8723	1.2090		
	Arts & Sciences	58	2.7414	1.1480		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	3.0000	1.5584		
	Pharmacy	37	3.0811	1.1874		
	Engineering	23	2.3913	1.2336		
	Journalism	32	2.9063	1.3286		
	Architecture	17	3.0588	1.2976		
	Nursing	18	2.5000	.7859		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	3.2885	1.2100		
	TOTAL	374	2.8449			

ITEM VI - c.*(Gp 9 sign diff from Gps 2 & 7) - *(Gp 6 sign diff from Gp 7) - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gps 2 & 7) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gp 7) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 7). < .05 Level

ITEM VI - d.*(Gp 6 sign diff from Gp 10) - *(Gp 9 sign diff from Gp 10) - Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 10) - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gp 10). < .05 Level

Table 35

An inspection of Table 35 showed a summary of means when students from 10 (ten) schools and colleges responded to what they admired about their mentor. The data showed the following: students in Allied Health Sciences (m 2.29) and students in Pharmacy (m 2.28) achieved significantly greater means than students in Engineering (m 1.74); students in Architecture (m 2.23), Allied Health Sciences (m 2.29), Pharmacy (m 2.28), and Business and Industry (m 2.13) achieved significantly greater means than students in Education (m 1.76) when they responded that they admired courage in their mentor. An F ratio (F=2.590) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Allied Health Sciences and Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from students in Engineering, and students in Architecture, Allied Health Sciences, Pharmacy, and Business and Industry had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Education when they responded to this item.

Students in Pharmacy (m 2.09), Architecture (m 2.00), and Allied Health Sciences (m 1.80) achieved significantly greater means than students in Engineering (m 1.35), and students in Pharmacy (m 2.09) achieved significantly greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 1.59) and Education (m 1.69) when they responded that they admired academic skills in their mentor. An F ratio (F=2.014) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Pharmacy, Architecture, and Allied Health Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Engineering, and students in Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from students in Arts and Sciences and Education when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 2.19) and Pharmacy (m 2.00) achieved significantly greater means than students in Nursing (m 1.33), Education (m 1.40), Engineering (m 1.43), Business and Industry (m 1.51), Journalism (m 1.53), Arts and Sciences (m 1.64), and Allied Health Sciences (m 1.65) when they responded that they admired the leadership roles of their mentors. An F ratio (F=3.838) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Architecture and Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Nursing, Education, Engineering, Business and Industry, Journalism, Arts and Sciences, and Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 1.88) achieved significantly greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.28), Engineering (m 1.75), Nursing (m 1.35), Business and Industry (m 1.36), Education (m 1.43), and Allied Health Sciences (m 1.44) when they responded that they admired dedication and concern (caring) in their mentor. An F ratio (F=1.827) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Journalism, Engineering, Business and Industry, Nursing, Education, and Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Pharmacy (m 2.28), Engineering (m 2.05), Business and Industry (m 2.04), and Arts and Sciences (m 1.83) achieved significantly greater means than students in Journalism (m 1.38), and students in Pharmacy (m 2.28) achieved significantly greater means than students in Engineering (m 1.57), Nursing (m 1.65), Allied Health Sciences (m 1.67), Education (m 1.72), and Business and Industry (m 2.04) when they responded that they admired good teaching skills on the part of their mentor. An F ratio (F=3.251) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Pharmacy, Engineering, Business and Industry, and Arts and Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Journalism, and students in Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Engineering, Nursing, Allied Health Sciences, Education, and Business and Industry when they responded to this item.

TABLE 35

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS RESPONSES INDICATED WHAT THEY ADMIRED MOST ABOUT THEIR MENTOR

ITEM VII	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Courage	Education	75	1.7600	.8194	2.590	.0067
	Business and Industry	47	2.1277	.8500		
	Arts & Sciences	58	1.9828	.8055		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	11	2.0000	.7746		
	Pharmacy	36	2.2778	.7015	*	
	Engineering	23	1.7391	.8100		
	Journalism	32	2.0000	.7620		
	Architecture	15	2.3333	.8165		
	Nursing	17	1.9412	.8269		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	2.2885	.8480		
	TOTAL	366	2.0273			
b. Academic Skills	Education	75	1.6933	.9001	2.014	.0369
	Business and Industry	47	1.7447	.7061		
	Arts & Sciences	58	1.5862	.7955		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	1.8462	.5547		
	Pharmacy	35	2.0857	.7811	*	
	Engineering	23	1.3478	.5728		
	Journalism	32	1.6875	.7803		
	Architecture	15	2.0000	.8452		
	Nursing	18	1.6111	.6077		
	Allied Health Sciences	51	1.8039	.7751		
	TOTAL	367	1.7275			

ITEM VII - a.*(Gp 6 sign diff from Gps 5 & 10) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gps 2, 5, 8 & 10).
ITEM VII - b.*(Gp 6 sign diff from Gps 5, 8 & 10) - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gp 5) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 5).

TABLE 35 (continued)

ITEM VII	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
c. Leadership Role	Education	75	1.4000	.6576	3.838	.0001
	Business and Industry	47	1.5106	.7766		
	Arts & Sciences	58	1.6379	.7181		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	1.8571	.5345		
	Pharmacy	36	2.0000	.8944		
	Engineering	23	1.4348	.6624		
	Journalism	32	1.5313	.7177		
	Architecture	16	2.1875	.8342		
	Nursing	18	1.3333	.5941		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	1.6538	.6827		
	TOTAL	371	1.6065			
d. Dedication and concern (caring).	Education	75	1.4267	.6189	1.827	.0620
	Business and Industry	47	1.3617	.7640		
	Arts & Sciences	59	1.5593	.7590		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	1.6429	.4972		
	Pharmacy	36	1.6389	.7232	*	
	Engineering	23	1.3478	.5728		
	Journalism	32	1.2813	.4568		
	Architecture	16	1.8750	.8062		
	Nursing	17	1.3529	.4926		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	1.4423	.5744		
	TOTAL	371	1.8059			

ITEM VII - c.*(Gp 9 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) - *(Gp 6 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) - *(Gp 2 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) - *(Gp 7 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gps 5 & 8). $<$ .05 Level

ITEM VII - d.*(Gp 7 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 6 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 9 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 2 sign diff from GP 8) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 8) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gp 8).

TABLE 35 (continued)

ITEM VII	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e. Good teaching skills.	Education	75	1.7200	.8473	3.251	.0008
	Business and Industry	47	2.0426	.9771		
	Arts & Sciences	58	1.8276	.9577		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	2.0714	1.0716	*	
	Pharmacy	36	2.2778	.8146		
	Engineering	23	1.5652	.7278		
	Journalism	32	1.3750	.6091		
	Architecture	17	1.9412	.8269		
	Nursing	17	1.6471	.7019		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	1.6731	.7852		
	TOTAL	371	1.8059			

ITEM VII - e.*(Gp 7 sign diff from Gps 2, 3, 4 & 5) - *(Gp 6 sign diff from Gp 5) - *(Gp 9 sign diff from Gp 5) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gp 5) - *(Gp 1 sign diff from Gp 5) - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gp 5). <.05 Level

Table 36

An inspection of Table 36 showed a summary of means when students from 10 (ten) schools and colleges described what they gained from their mentor relationship. The data shows that students in Education (m 4.33), Engineering (m 4.22), and Arts and Sciences (m 4.12) achieved significantly greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 1.67), and students in Education (m 4.33), Engineering (m 4.22), Arts and Sciences (m 4.12), and Business and Industry (m 4.09) achieved significantly greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 3.71) when they responded that they had gained self-esteem from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=3.043) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences, Pharmacy, Engineering, Business and Industry, and Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Education (m 4.17) achieved significantly greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 3.56), Allied Health Sciences (m 3.65), Journalism (m 3.66), and Business and Industry (m 3.75) when they identified courage as a benefit gained from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=2.204) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Pharmacy, Allied Health Sciences, Journalism, and Business and Industry when they responded to this item.

Students in Nursing (m 4.67), Education (m 4.53) and Business and Industry (m 4.40), achieved significantly greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 4.02), and students in Nursing (m 4.67), and

Education (m 4.53) achieved significantly greater means than students in Journalism (m 4.09), Pharmacy (m 4.14), and Arts and Sciences (m 4.21) when they responded that they gained determination from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=2.930) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Nursing, Education, and Business and Industry had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Allied Health Sciences, and students in Nursing and Education achieved significantly greater means than students in Journalism, Pharmacy, and Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Nursing (m 4.72), Business and Industry (m 4.57), and Education (m 4.56) achieved significantly greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 4.13) when they responded that they gained a desire to achieve from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=2.930) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Nursing, Education, and Business and Industry had mean scores which differed significantly from students in Allied Health Sciences, and students in Nursing and Education achieved significantly greater mean scores than those of students in Journalism, Pharmacy, and Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Nursing (m 4.72), Business and Industry (m 4.57), and Education (m 4.56) achieved significantly greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 4.13) when they responded that they gained a desire to achieve from their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=1.928) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Nursing, Business and Industry, and Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Allied Health Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Education (m 4.31) achieved significantly greater means than students in Architecture (m 3.76) and Pharmacy (m 3.94) when they responded that they had gained academic growth from their mentor relationship. An F ratio ($F=1.632$) was computed at the $< .05$ level of significance. Students in Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture and Pharmacy when they responded to this item.

TABLE 36

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED GAINS FROM THEIR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

ITEM VIII	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Self-esteem.	Education	75	4.3333	.7941	3.043	.0016
	Business and Industry	47	4.0851	.8805		
	Arts and Sciences	58	4.1207	.8393		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.0000	.8452		
	Pharmacy	36	3.6667	.8619	*	
	Engineering	23	4.2174	.6713		
	Journalism	32	3.9688	.9995		
	Architecture	17	3.8235	.8090		
	Nursing	18	4.2222	.8085		
	Allied Health Sciences	51	3.7059	.9229		
	TOTAL	372	4.0376			
b. Courage.	Education	75	4.1733	.7420	2.204	.0213
	Business and Industry	47	3.7447	.9884		
	Arts and Sciences	57	3.8596	.7181		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	3.8000	.9411	*	
	Pharmacy	36	3.5556	.9694		
	Engineering	22	3.9091	.7502		
	Journalism	32	3.6563	.9019		
	Architecture	17	3.7059	.7717		
	Nursing	18	3.9444	.9376		
	Allied Health Sciences	51	3.6471	1.0550		
	TOTAL	370	3.8297			

ITEM VIII - a.*(Gp 5 sign diff from Gps 1, 3 & 6) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gps 1, 2, 3 & 6).
ITEM VIII - b.*(Gp 5 sign diff from Gp 1) - *(Gp 10 sign diff from Gp 1) - *(Gp 7 sign diff from Gp 1) - *(Gp 2 sign diff from Gp 1).

TABLE 36 (continued)

ITEM VIII	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
c. Determination.	Education	75	4.5333	.6644	2.930	.0023
	Business and Industry	47	4.4043	.7419		
	Arts & Sciences	58	4.2069	.7196		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.0667	.8837	*	
	Pharmacy	36	4.1389	.7617		
	Engineering	23	4.2609	.6887		
	Journalism	32	4.0938	.9284		
	Architecture	17	4.1176	.6002		
	Nursing	18	4.6667	.5941		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	4.0192	.8743		
	TOTAL	373	4.2708			
d. A desire to achieve.	Education	75	4.5600	.7396	1.928	.0470
	Business and Industry	47	4.5745	.6509		
	Arts & Sciences	58	4.4138	.8172		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.2000	.9411		
	Pharmacy	36	4.3611	.5929	*	
	Engineering	23	4.4783	.6653		
	Journalism	32	4.3750	.7931		
	Architecture	17	4.3529	.7859		
	Nursing	18	4.7222	.4609		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	4.1346	.8172		
	TOTAL	373	4.4236			

ITEM VIII - c.*(Gp 10 sign diff from Gps 1, 2 & 9) - *(Gp 7 sign diff from Gps 1 & 9) - *(Gp 5 sign diff from Gps 1 & 9) - *(Gp 3 sign diff from Gps 1 & 9).

ITEM VIII - d.*(Gp 10 sign diff from Gps 1, 2 & 9).

TABLE 36 (continued)

ITEM VIII		GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e.	A desire to set goals for my future.	Education	74	4.4324	.8453	1.427	.1748
		Business and Industry	47	4.4894	.6552		
		Arts & Sciences	58	4.4310	.7749		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.5333	.6399		
		Pharmacy	36	4.1944	.7863		
		Engineering	23	4.5217	.5931		
		Journalism	31	4.1290	.9217		
		Architecture	16	4.0625	.9979		
		Nursing	18	4.4444	.7048		
		Allied Health Sciences	52	4.1923	.8641		
		TOTAL	370	4.3514			
f.	Academic growth.	Education	75	4.3067	.6970	1.632	.1044
		Business and Industry	47	4.0000	.8341		
		Arts & Sciences	58	4.2241	.8593		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.3333	.7237		
		Pharmacy	36	3.9444	.7908		
		Engineering	23	4.2609	.5408		
		Journalism	32	4.0938	.6891		
		Architecture	17	3.7647	1.0326		
		Nursing	18	4.3333	.7670		
		Allied Health Sciences	52	4.0962	.7985		
		TOTAL	373	4.1475			

Table 37

An inspection of Table 37 showed a summary of means when students from 10 (ten) school and colleges responded to the qualities that their mentor should exhibit. Students in Pharmacy (m 4.56), Education (m 4.55), and Business and Industry (m 4.54) achieved significantly greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.95) when they responded that their mentor needed to show concern for their academic performance. An F ratio (F=2.348) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Pharmacy, Education, and Business and Industry had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Pharmacy (m 4.64), Business and Industry (m 4.57), Education (m 4.38), and Allied Health Sciences (m 4.32) achieved significantly greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.89) when they responded that their mentor needed to exhibit a willingness to make constructive suggestions. An F ratio (F=2.357) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Pharmacy, Business and Industry, Education, and Allied Health Sciences had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Pharmacy (m 4.444), Business and Industry (m 4.41) and Education (m 4.28) achieved significantly greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.85) when they responded that their mentor needed to provide them with moral support. An F ratio (F=1.482) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Pharmacy, Business and Industry and Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Business and Industry (m 4.52), Journalism (m 4.50), Education (m 4.36), and Pharmacy (m 4.31) achieved significantly greater means than students in Architecture (m 3.65), and students in Business and Industry (m 4.52) and Journalism (m 4.50) achieved significantly greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.96) when they responded that their mentors needed to show interest in their professional growth. An F ratio (F=1.982) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Business and Industry, Journalism, Education, and Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture, and students in Business and Industry and Journalism had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Business and Industry (m 4.47) achieved significantly greater means than students in Architecture (m 3.76) when they responded that their mentor needed to show willingness for mutual trust. An F ratio (F=1.103) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Business and Industry had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture when they responded to this item.

Students in Business and Industry (m 4.62), Pharmacy (m 4.53), and Education (m 4.41) achieved significantly greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 4.00) when they responded that their mentor needed to exhibit open-mindedness. An F ratio (F=1.604) was computed at the<.05

level of significance. Students in Business and Industry, Pharmacy, and Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Education (m 4.45) achieved significantly greater means than students in Architecture (m 3.75), and students in Journalism (m 4.48) and students in Education (m 4.45) achieved greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.78) when they responded that their mentor needed to personify good teaching. An F ratio (F=2.061) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture, and students in Journalism and Education earned mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Business and Industry (m 4.49), Pharmacy (m 5.45), and Education (m 4.41) achieved significantly greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 3.83) when they responded that their mentors needed to be easy to get along with. An F ratio (F=1.481) was computed at$<$ .05 level of significance. Students in Business and Industry, Pharmacy, and Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

TABLE 37

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED QUALITIES THAT THEIR MENTOR SHOULD EXHIBIT

ITEM IX	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Concern about my academic performance.	Education	75	4.5467	.7934	2.348	.0139
	Business and Industry	46	4.5435	.5852		
	Arts & Sciences	57	3.9474	1.3813		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.0667	.9612		
	Pharmacy	36	4.5556	.6068		
	Engineering	23	4.3478	1.1912	*	
	Journalism	32	4.4375	.8007	*	
	Architecture	17	4.0588	1.2485	*	
	Nursing	18	4.0556	1.4742		
	Allied Health Sciences	53	4.2264	.8910		
	TOTAL	372	4.3226			
b. Willingness to make constructive suggestions.	Education	75	4.3867	.9138	2.357	.0135
	Business and Industry	46	4.5652	.5832		
	Arts & Sciences	57	3.8947	1.3050		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.2000	.6761	*	
	Pharmacy	36	4.6389	.5929	*	
	Engineering	23	4.3913	1.0331	*	
	Journalism	32	4.3438	1.0659	*	
	Architecture	17	4.0000	1.0607		
	Nursing	18	4.1111	1.4907		
	Allied Health	53	4.3208	.8032		
	TOTAL	372	4.3065			

ITEM IX-a*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 2)
ITEM IX-a*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM XI-a*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 5)
<.05 Level

ITEM IX-b*(gr. 3 sig. diff from gr. 10)
ITEM IX-b*(gr. 3 sig. diff from gr. 1)
ITEM IX-b*(gr. 3 sig. diff from gr. 2)
ITEM IX-b*(gr. 3 sig. diff from gr. 5)

TABLE 37 (continued)

ITEM IX	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
c. Accessible to help.	Education	74	4.2973	.9324	1.809	.0653
	Business and Industry	46	4.5217	.7223	*	
	Arts & Sciences	57	3.9123	1.2717	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.3333	.7237	*	
	Pharmacy	36	4.5556	.6068		
	Engineering	23	4.3043	1.0196		
	Journalism	32	4.2813	1.0846		
	Architecture	17	4.0000	.9354		
	Nursing	18	4.0000	1.4552		
	Allied Health Sciences	53	4.3019	.9320		
	TOTAL	371	4.2642			
d. Provide moral support.	Education	75	4.2800	.9381	1.482	.1527
	Business and Industry	46	4.4140	.6856	*	
	Arts & Sciences	56	3.8571	1.2994	*	
	Eng. Sci., TEch., Agri.	15	4.2000	.7746	*	
	Pharmacy	36	4.4444	.6957		
	Engineering	23	4.2609	.9154		
	Journalism	32	4.2188	1.0994		
	Architecture	17	3.8824	1.0537		
	Nursing	18	4.0556	1.5136		
	Allied Health Sciences	53	4.1887	.9619		
	TOTAL	371	4.1968			

ITEM IX-c*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM IX-c*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 2)
ITEM IX-c*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 5)

ITEM IX-d*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM IX-d*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 2)
ITEM IX-d*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 5)

TABLE 37 (continued)

ITEM IX		GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e.	Show interest in my professional growth.	Education	75	4.3600	.9951	1.982	.0404
		Business and Industry	46	4.5217	.6232		
		Arts & Sciences	57	3.9649	1.2813	*	
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.4667	.7432	*	
		Pharmacy	36	4.3056	.8218	*	
		Engineering	23	4.3478	1.1524	*	
		Journalism	32	4.5000	1.0160	*	
		Architecture	17	3.6471	.9963	*	
		Nursing	18	4.1111	1.5297	*	
		Allied Health Sciences	53	4.2453	4.2453	*	
		TOTAL	372	4.2688			
f.	Capacity to establish connections for me.	Education	74	4.0000	1.0337	1.061	.3912
		Business and Industry	46	3.7609	.9930		
		Arts & Sciences	57	3.7193	1.3060		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.2000	.7746		
		Pharmacy	35	3.7429	.8521		
		Engineering	23	4.2174	.9980		
		Journalism	32	4.0625	1.1053		
		Architecture	17	3.5882	1.1757		
		Nursing	18	3.7778	1.4371		
		Allied Health Sciences	53	3.7547	1.1078		
		TOTAL	370	3.8649			

ITEM IX-d*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM IX-d*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 2)
ITEM IX-d*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 5)
ITEM IX-e*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 7)
ITEM IX-e*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 2)

IX-e*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 5)
IX-e*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
IX-e*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 7)
IX-e*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 2)

TABLE 37 (continued)

ITEM IX	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
g. Willingness for mutual trust.	Education	75	4.3333	.9492	1.103	.3597
	Business and Industry	45	4.4667	.6606	*	
	Arts & Sciences	56	4.0000	1.2649		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	15	4.1333	.6399		
	Pharmacy	36	4.3056	.7863		
	Engineering	23	4.2609	1.0962		
	Journalism	32	4.1875	1.1483		
	Architecture	17	3.7647	1.2005		
	Nursing	18	4.1667	1.5049		
	Allied Health Sciences	52	4.2885	1.0354		
	TOTAL	369	4.2304			
h. Open mindedness.	Education	75	4.4133	.9599	1.604	.1125
	Business and Industry	45	4.6222	.5347		
	Arts & Sciences	56	4.0000	1.3348	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	4.2143	.6993	*	
	Pharmacy	36	4.5278	.6964	*	
	Engineering	23	4.1739	1.1140		
	Journalism	31	4.3871	1.0856		
	Architecture	17	4.0588	1.1440		
	Nursing	18	4.1667	1.3827		
	Allied Health Sciences	53	4.3208	.8721		
	TOTAL	368	4.3207			

ITEM IX-g*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 2)

ITEM IX-h*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM IX-h*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 5)
ITEM IX-h*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 2)

TABLE 37 (continued)

ITEM IX	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
i. Personifies good teaching.	Education	74	4.4459	.9672	2.061	.0326
	Business and Industry	45	4.0222	.9167	*	
	Arts & Sciences	36	3.7778	1.2898	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	4.1429	.8644	*	
	Pharmacy	33	4.2727	.8394		
	Engineering	18	3.8889	1.2783		
	Journalism	31	4.4839	1.0605		
	Architecture	16	3.7500	1.1255		
	Nursing	18	4.1111	1.3672		
	Allied Health Sciences	51	4.1176	1.3672		
	TOTAL	336	4.1607	.9305		
j. Easy to get along with.	Education	74	4.4054	1.0193	1.481	.1538
	Business and Industry	45	4.4889	.6260	*	
	Arts & Sciences	35	3.8286	1.2945	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	4.3846	.7579	*	
	Pharmacy	33	4.4545	.6657		
	Engineering	18	4.0556	1.2590		
	Journalism	32	4.2500	1.0776		
	Architecture	16	4.1250	.9574		
	Nursing	18	4.0556	1.5136		
	Allied Health Sciences	51	4.3137	.9693		
	TOTAL	335	4.2806			

ITEM IX-i*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM IX-i*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM IX-i*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 7)

ITEM IX-j*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM IX-j*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 5)
ITEM IX-j*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 2)

Table 38

An inspection of Table 38 showed a summary of means when students from 10 colleges and schools identified significant qualities that their ideal mentor should have. Students in Engineering (m 4.73) and Education (m 4.71) achieved significantly greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 4.26) and Journalism (4.28), and students in Education (m 4.71) achieved significantly greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 4.35) when they responded that a strong concept is an important quality in a good mentor. An F ratio (F=2.710) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Engineering and Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Allied Health Sciences and Journalism when they responded to this item. Students in Education earned mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Pharmacy when they responded to this item.

Students in Journalism (m 4.66) achieved significantly greater means than students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture (m 4.08), Pharmacy (m 4.21), and Allied Health Sciences (m 4.25), and students in Journalism (m 4.66) and Education (m 4.51) achieved significantly greater means than students in Arts and Sciences (m 4.16) when they responded that their ideal mentor has had experiences worth sharing. An F ratio (F=2.208) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Journalism had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy, and Allied Health Sciences; students in Journalism and Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering (m 4.64), students in Business and Industry (m 4.58), and students in Education (m 4.53) achieved significantly greater means than students in Architecture (m 4.06) when they responded that their ideal mentor had an openness that was important to the relationship. An F ratio (F=1.635) was computed at the $< .05$ level of significance. Students in Engineering, Business and Industry, and Education had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering (m 4.62), Journalism (m 4.50), Business and Industry (m 4.49), Education (m 4.44), Nursing (m 4.39), Arts and Sciences (m 4.22), and Pharmacy (m 2.21) achieved significantly greater means than students in Architecture (m 3.76) when they responded that their mentor had foresight. An F ratio (F=2.563) was computed at the $<.05$ level of significance. Students in Engineering, Journalism, Business and Industry, Education, Nursing, Arts and Sciences, and Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture when they responded to this item.

TABLE 38

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED SIGNIFICANT QUALITIES OF THEIR IDEAL MENTOR

ITEM X	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Strong self-concept.	Education	75	4.7067	.6101	2.710	.0046
	Business and Industry	45	4.5111	.5486	*	
	Arts & Sciences	55	4.4545	.7408	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	4.2857	.7263	*	
	Pharmacy	34	4.3529	.6912	*	
	Engineering	22	4.7273	.5505	*	
	Journalism	32	4.2813	.8126		
	Architecture	17	4.5294	.6243		
	Nursing	18	4.6667	.5941		
	Allied Health Sciences	53	4.2642	.6836		
	TOTAL	365	4.4849			
b. Experiences worth sharing.	Education	75	4.5067	.7047	2.208	.0211
	Business and Industry	45	4.2222	.6905	*	
	Arts and Sciences	55	4.1636	.7880	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	4.0769	.7596	*	
	Pharmacy	34	4.2059	.8801	*	
	Engineering	23	4.4783	.6653	*	
	Jounalism	32	4.6564	.6530		
	Architecture	17	4.2941	.6860		
	Nursing	18	4.5556	.7048		
	Allied Health Sciences	53	4.2453	.6476		
	TOTAL	365	4.3671			

ITEM X-a*(gr. 10 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM X-a*(gr. 10 sig. diff. from gr. 6)
ITEM X-a*(gr. 7 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM X-a*(gr. 7 sig. diff. from gr. 6)
ITEM X-a*(gr. 5 sig. diff. from gr. 1)

ITEM X-b*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 7)
ITEM X-b*(gr. 5 sig. diff. from gr. 7)
ITEM X-b*(gr. 10 sig. diff. from gr. 7)
ITEM X-b*(gr. 4 sig. diff. from gr. 7)
ITEM X-b*(gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 1)

< .05 Level

TABLE 38 (continued)

ITEM X	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
c. Openness.	Education	75	4.5333	.6844	1.635	.1038
	Business and Industry	45	4.5778	.6567	*	
	Arts and Sciences	55	4.2909	.7858	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	4.2143	.6993	*	
	Pharmacy	34	4.4118	.6568		
	Engineering	22	4.6364	.6580		
	Journalism	32	4.4375	.6690		
	Architecture	17	4.0588	.8269		
	Nursing	18	4.4444	.7048		
	Allied Health Sciences	53	4.3396	.6778		
	TOTAL	365	4.4219			
d. Foresight.	Education	75	4.4400	.7925	2.563	.0072
	Business and Industry	45	4.889	.5886	*	
	Arts and Sciences	55	4.2182	.6856	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	4.2143	.6993	*	
	Pharmacy	34	4.2059	.7294	*	
	Engineering	21	4.6190	.5896	*	
	Journalism	32	4.5000	.6222	*	
	Architecture	17	3.7647	.7524	*	
	Nursing	18	4.3889	.7775	*	
	Allied Health Sciences	53	4.3208	.7278	*	
	TOTAL	364	4.3462			

ITEM X-c*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM X-c*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 2)
ITEM X-c*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 6)
ITEM X-d*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 5)
ITEM X-d*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 3)
ITEM X-d*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 10)
ITEM X-d*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 9)
ITEM X-d*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 1)
ITEM X-d*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 2)
ITEM X-d*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 7)
ITEM X-d*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 6)

Table 39

An inspection of Table 39 showed a summary of the means for 10 (ten) colleges and schools when students identified some negative outcomes from their mentor relationship. The data showed that students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture (m 2.25) gained significantly greater means than students in Nursing (m 1.28) when they responded that their mentor withdrew from the relationship. An F ratio (F=1.153) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture and Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Nursing when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture (m 2.29) and Architecture (m 1.94) achieved greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.25), and students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture (m 2.29) achieved significantly greater means than students in Nursing (m 1.33), Journalism (m 1.34), Pharmacy (m 1.46), Education (m 1.25), and Architecture (m 1.94) when they responded that a negative outcome of their mentor relationship was due to mentor jealousy. An F ratio (F=2.359) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture, Nursing, Journalism, Business and Industry, Engineering, Pharmacy, Education, and Architecture when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m

2.23) achieved significantly greater means than students in Pharmacy (m 1.37) when they responded that their mentor removed himself/herself from the area. An F ratio (F=1.166) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Pharmacy when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 2.81) achieved significantly greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.54), Journalism (m 1.72), Education (m 1.64), Pharmacy (m 1.71), Nursing (m 1.72), Business and Industry (m 1.74), Arts and Sciences (m 1.80), and Engineering (m 1.90) when they responded that their mentor became too involved in personal business to give them necessary time. An F ratio (F=2.556) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Allied Health Sciences, Journalism, Education, Pharmacy, Nursing, Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, and Engineering when they responded to this item.

Students in Architecture (m 2.19) achieved significantly greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.44) when they responded that their mentor behaved like a "mother hen" or caused dependency. An F ratio (F=1.400) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Architecture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Allied Health Science when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (m 2.00) and Journalism (m 1.97) achieved significantly greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.10), Architecture (m 1.13), Pharmacy (m 1.28), Education (m 1.32), Engineering (m 1.33), and Arts and Sciences (m 1.43) when they responded that the death of their mentor was a negative outcome of their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=3.310) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture and students in Journalism had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Allied Health Sciences, Architecture, Pharmacy, Business and Industry, Nursing, Education, Engineering, and Arts and Sciences, when they responded to this item.

Students in Engineering Sciences Technology and Agriculture (m 2.15) and students in Journalism (m 1.73) achieved significantly greater means than students in Allied Health Sciences (m 1.16), Pharmacy (m 1.21), Architecture (m 1.20), Nursing (m 1.28), Education (m 1.36), Engineering (m 1.43), Business and Industry (m 1.43), and Arts and Sciences (m 1.53) when they responded that illness of the mentor caused a negative outcome in their mentor relationship. An F ratio (F=2.185) was computed at the <.05 level of significance. Students in Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Allied Health Sciences, Pharmacy, Engineering, Architecture, Nursing, Education, Business and Industry, and Arts and Sciences when they responded to this item.

TABLE 39

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS RESPONSES INDICATED SOME NEGATIVE OUTCOMES FROM THEIR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

ITEM XI	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Mentor withdrawal from the relationship.	Education	74	1.8378	1.1590	1.153	.3245
	Business and Industry	46	1.7174	1.0680	*	
	Arts & Sciences	55	1.8364	1.1347	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	12	2.2500	1.4222		
	Pharmacy	34	1.6176	.8170		
	Engineering	21	1.6190	.8047		
	Journalism	32	1.8438	1.1670		
	Architecture	16	2.1875	.9106		
	Nursing	18	1.2778	.9583		
	Allied Health Sciences	50	1.7800	1.0746		
	TOTAL	358	1.7821			
b. Mentor jealous of protege'.	Education	74	1.5676	1.0348	2.359	.0135
	Business and Industry	46	1.3478	.6739	*	
	Arts & Sciences	55	1.6727	1.0896	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	14	2.2857	1.5407	*	
	Pharmacy	35	1.4571	1.0387	*	
	Engineering	21	1.4286	.8106	*	
	Journalism	32	1.3438	.6530	*	
	Architecture	16	1.9375	1.1815	*	
	Nursing	18	1.3333	1.0290	*	
	Allied Health Sciences	51	1.2549	.6883	*	
	TOTAL	362	1.5055			

ITEM XI-a*(gr. 9 sig. diff. from gr. 8)
ITEM XI-a*(gr. 9 sig. diff. from gr. 4)

TABLE 39 (continued)

	ITEM XI	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
c.	Mentor removed himself/ herself from the area.	Education	73	1.7945	1.1175	1.166	.3156
		Business and Industry	46	1.9130	1.3796	*	
		Arts & Sciences	54	1.7037	1.0751		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.2308	1.4806		
		Pharmacy	35	1.3714	.7702		
		Engineering	20	1.6000	1.0463		
		Journalism	32	1.6563	1.1807		
		Architecture	16	2.0625	1.2366		
		Nursing	18	1.4444	.9835		
		Allied Health Sciences	50	1.7200	1.0698		
		TOTAL	357	1.7311			
d.	Protege' lost communication with mentor.	Education	73	1.9726	1.2469	.712	.6977
		Business and Industry	46	2.0870	1.3470		
		Arts & Sciences	55	2.0545	1.2386		
		Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.2308	1.3634		
		Pharmacy	35	1.7143	1.1265		
		Engineering	22	1.9545	1.0901		
		Journalism	32	2.0625	1.4128		
		Architecture	16	2.4375	1.2093		
		Nursing	18	1.9444	1.2113		
		Allied Health Sciences	49	1.7755	1.0852		
		TOTAL	359	1.9833			

TABLE 39 (continued)

ITEM XI	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
e. Mentor became too involved in personal functions to give the necessary time.	Education	73	1.6438	1.0849	2.556	.0074
	Business and Industry	46	1.7391	.9294	*	
	Arts & Sciences	54	1.7963	1.1877	*	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.2308	1.2352	*	
	Pharmacy	35	1.7143	1.0167	*	
	Engineering	21	1.9048	.8891	*	
	Journalism	32	1.6250	1.0999	*	
	Architecture	16	2.8125	.9811	*	
	Nursing	18	1.7222	1.2274	*	
	Allied Health Sciences	50	1.5400	.8621	*	
	TOTAL	358	1.7626			
f. Mentor as "mother hen" to protege' (dependency).	Education	73	1.8904	1.2863	1.400	.1866
	Business and Industry	46	1.6304	1.0616	*	
	Arts & Sciences	54	1.8519	1.2039		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., AGri.	12	2.2500	1.2881		
	Pharmacy	35	1.5429	.8859		
	Engineering	22	1.7727	1.0660		
	Journalism	32	1.6563	1.0659		
	Architecture	16	2.1875	1.1087		
	Nursing	18	1.7222	1.1785		
	Allied Health Sciences	50	1.4400	.7866		
	TOTAL	358	1.7430			

TABLE 39 (continued)

ITEM XI	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
g. Mentor and protege' acting as buddies.	Education	71	2.0704	1.2227	.743	.6691
	Business and Industry	46	1.9130	1.1121		
	Arts & Sciences	54	2.1296	1.2293		
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.3846	1.5021		
	Pharmacy	35	1.8571	1.1413		
	Engineering	21	1.7143	1.1019		
	Journalism	31	1.9677	1.2243		
	Architecture	16	2.1250	1.1475		
	Nursing	16	2.1875	1.4245		
	Allied Health Sciences	48	1.7708	.9280		
	TOTAL	351	1.9858			
h. Death of mentor.	Education	73	1.3151	.7972	3.310	.0007
	Business and Industry	46	1.2609	.7434	**	
	Arts & Sciences	53	1.4340	.8882	**	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.0000	1.5275	**	
	Pharmacy	34	1.1471	.7020	**	
	Engineering	21	1.3333	.7303	**	
	Journalism	30	1.9667	1.5196	**	
	Architecture	15	1.1333	.5164	**	
	Nursing	18	1.2778	.9583	**	
	Allied Health Sciences	49	1.1020	.4675		
	TOTAL	352	1.3523			

TABLE 39 (continued)

ITEM XI	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
1. Illness of mentor.	Education	73	1.3562	.8719	2.185	.0226
	Business and Industry	46	1.4348	.9346	**	
	Arts & Sciences	53	1.5283	1.0115	**	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	13	2.1538	1.5191	**	
	Pharmacy	34	1.2059	.7699	**	
	Engineering	21	1.4286	.8701	*	
	Journalism	30	1.7333	1.2576	*	
	Architecture	15	1.2000	.5606		
	Nursing	18	1.2778	.9583		
	Allied Health Sciences	49	1.1633	.5533		
	TOTAL	352	1.4063			

Table 40

An inspection of Table 40 showed a summary of the means for students in 10 (ten) colleges and schools when they responded to what their grade point average is. The data showed students in Pharmacy (m 3.06), Allied Health Sciences (m 3.04), Engineering (m 3.02), Journalism (m 2.97), Business and Industry (m 2.88), and Arts and Sciences (m 2.83) achieved significantly greater means than students in Education (m 2.67), Pharmacy (m 3.04), Allied Health Sciences (m 2.77), and in Arts and Sciences (m 2.83), and students in Pharmacy (m 3.06) achieved significantly greater means than students in Business and Industry (m 2.88) when they responded to their GPA. An F ratio (F=4.675) was computed at the < .05 level of significance. Students in Pharmacy had mean score which differed significantly from those of students in Pharmacy, Allied Health Sciences, Engineering, Journalism, Business and Industry, and Arts and Sciences and Education; students in Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences earned mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Architecture, and Arts and Sciences. Students in Pharmacy had mean scores which differed significantly from those of students in Business and Industry when they responded to this item.

TABLE 40

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCE AMONG SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WHEN STUDENTS' RESPONSES INDICATED GRADE POINT AVERAGE

ITEM XII	GROUP SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES	N	MEAN	SD	F-RATIO	F-PROB
a. Grade point average (GPA).	Education	87	2.6685	.5014	4.675	.0000
	Business and Industry	75	2.8753	.3874	**	
	Arts & Sciences	73	2.8348	.5133	**	
	Eng. Sci., Tech., Agri.	25	2.8440	.6193	**	
	Pharmacy	56	3.0641	.4794	**	
	Engineering	29	3.0241	.3795	**	
	Journalism	41	2.9722	.4551	*	
	Architecture	28	2.7746	.2967		
	Nursing	17	2.8847	.4321		
	Allied Health Sciences	63	3.0425	.4209		
	TOTAL	494	2.8854			

ITEM XII-a*(gr. 1 sig. diff. from gr. 3)
ITEM XII-a*(gr. 1 sig. diff. from gr. 2)
ITEM XII-a*(gr. 1 sig. diff. from gr. 7)
ITEM XII-a*(gr. 1 sig. diff. from gr. 6)
ITEM XII-a*(gr. 1 sig. diff. from gr. 10)
ITEM XII-a*(gr. 1 sig. diff. from gr. 5)

ITEM XII-a*(gr. 8 sig. diff. from gr. 10)
ITEM XII-a*(gr. 8 sig. diff from gr. 5)
ITEM XII-a*(gr. 2 sig. diff. from gr. 5)
ITEM XII-a*(*gr. 3 sig. diff. from gr. 10)
ITEM XII-a*(gr. 3 sig. diff from gr. 5)

SEX

1. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when their reasons for not having a mentor are compared.

To test hypothesis 1, a group comparison was carried out between the means of two sexes. Table 1 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to their reasons for not having a mentor. The F ratios computed were: F=4.183; F=8.086; F=8.14; and F=15.51, at the $<.05$ level of significance. There were significant differences between the males and females; therefore, hypothesis 1 was rejected.

2. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when the identification of behavior exhibited by mentors at FAMU are compared.

To test hypothesis 2 a group comparison was carried out between the mean of two sexes. Table 2 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to what behaviors their mentor at FAMU exhibited. The F ratio computed was F=5.18 at the $<.05$ level of significance. Hypothesis 5, therefore, was rejected.

3a. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when the identification of events that hindered the mentor relationship are compared.

3b. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when the identification of events that helped the mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 3a and 3b, a group comparison was carried out between mean of two sexes. Table 3 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to things that hindered their mentor relationships. The F ratio computed was F=4.05, .05. Helpful behavior was handled the same as hindering behavior. A summary of means derived from students' responses computed F ratios as follows: F=6.06; F=12.58; and F=4.23, $<.05$ level of significance. Hypothesis 3a and 3b were rejected.

4. There will be no significant difference between students according to male and female when the identification of events that led to the development of the mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 3, a group comparison was carried out between the means of the two sexes. Table 4 contains a summary of the mean derived from student responses to what events led to the development of their mentor relationship. The F ratios computed were not significant. Hypothesis 4, therefore, was accepted.

5. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when the identification of traits admired about mentors are compared.

To test hypothesis 5, a group comparison was carried out between the mean of two sexes. Table 5 contains a summary of the mean derived from student responses to mentor traits that were admired by the students. The F ratio computed was $F=5.98$, $< .05$ level of significance. Hypothesis 5, therefore, was rejected.

6. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when the identification of benefits gained from the relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 6, a group comparison was carried out between the means of two sexes. Table 6 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to benefits gained from their mentor relationship. The F ratios computed were not significant; therefore, hypothesis 6 was accepted.

7. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when the idenfication of qualities that a mentor should have are compared.

To test hypothesis 7, a group comparison was carried out between the mean of two sexes. Table 7 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to qualities that they felt a mentor should have. The F ratios computed revealed no significant difference. Hypothesis 7, therefore, was accepted.

8. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when the identification of qualities of their ideal mentor are compared.

To test hypothesis 8, a group comparison was carried out between the means of two sexes. Table 8 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to significant qualities of their ideal mentor. The F ratios computed were $F=9.10$; $F=5.7$; and $F=5.5$, at the $<.05$ level of significance. Hypothesis 8, therefore, was rejected.

9. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when the identification of negative outcomes from their mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 9, a group comparison was carried out between the means of two sexes. Table 9 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to negative outcomes from their mentor relationships. The F ratios computed were: $F=6.00$; and $F=4.02$, at the $<.05$ level of significance. Hypothesis 9, therefore, was rejected.

10. There will be no significant difference between male and female students when overall grade point averages are compared.

To test hypothesis 10, a group comparison was carried out between the means of two sexes. Table 10 contains a summary of the means derived from the student response to identification of their overall grade point average. The F ratios computed revealed no significant difference between or within groups. Hypothesis 10, therefore, was accepted.

RACE

11. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when their reasons for not having a mentor are compared.

To test hypothesis 11, a group comparison was carried out among the mean of four racial groups. Table 11 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to reasons for not having a mentor at FAMU. The F ratios computed revealed no significant difference among the racial groups. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.

12. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of behavior exhibited by mentors at FAMU are compared.

To test hypothesis 12, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four racial groups. Table 12 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to behavior exhibited by their mentor at FAMU. The results are as follows: Significant differences were observed (F=4.09; F=3.92; F=4.64 and F=3.15) at the $<.05$ level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

13a. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of events that hindered the mentor relationship are compared.

13b. There will be no significant difference among students according to race the identification of events that helped the mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypotheses 13a and 13b, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four racial groups. Table 13a and 13b contain a summary of the means derived from the student responses to what behavior helped or hindered their mentor relationships. The F ratios were 5.90; 2.62; 3.06; 2.45; and 2.66. They were significant at the $<.05$ level. Hypothesis 13a and 13b, therefore, were rejected.

14. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of events that led to the development of a mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 14, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four racial groups. Table 14 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to events that led to the development of a mentor relationship. The F ratio computed were: F=12.06; F=8.19; F=6.6; F=4.6; F=6.08; and F=3.4, at the <.05 level of significance. Hypothesis 14, therefore, was rejected.

15. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of traits that were admired about mentors are compared.

To test hypothesis 15, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four racial groups. Table 15 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to what they admired about their mentor. The F ratios computed were: F=10.00; F=2.78; F=7.72; and F=2.81. With df (4,350), p= <.05. Hypothesis 15, therefore, was rejected.

16. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of benefits gained from the relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 16, a group comparison was carried out among the mean of four racial groups. Table 16 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to what benefits were gained from their mentor relationships. The F ratios computed were: F=12.06; F=8.19; F=6.6; F=4.6; F=6.08; and F=3.4, at the <.05 level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis 16 was rejected.

17. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of qualities that a mentor should have are compared.

To test hypothesis 17, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four racial groups. Table 17 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to what qualities they felt that their mentor needs to exhibit. The F ratios revealed no significant difference among the racial groups. Therefore, hypothesis 17 was accepted.

18. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of qualities of their ideal mentor are compared.

To test hypothesis 18, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four racial groups. Table 18 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to significant qualities of their ideal mentor. The F ratio 4.684 revealed a significant difference at the <.05 level. Therefore, hypothesis 18 was rejected.

19. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of negative outcomes from mentor relationships are compared.

To test hypothesis 19, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four racial groups. Table 19 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to the identification of some negative outcomes from their mentor relationships. The F ratio computed was $F=3.20$, $p= <.05$ level of significance. Hypothesis 19, therefore, was rejected.

20. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when overall grade point averages are compared.

To test hypothesis 20, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four racial groups. Table 20 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to the identification of their grade point averages. The F ratio was 13.9, at the $<.05$ level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis 20 was rejected.

CLASSIFICATION

21. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when their reasons for not having a mentor are compared.

To test hypothesis 21, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 21 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to reasons why they had not developed a mentor relationship while at FAMU. Item II-f revealed that group 3 (juniors) differed significantly from group 1 (freshmen); Item II-f, group 4 (seniors) differed significantly from group 1 (freshmen); and Item II-m, group 3 (juniors) differed significantly from group 4 (seniors), at the $<.05$ level of significance. Hypothesis 21, therefore, was rejected.

22. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when the identification of behavior exhibited by mentors at FAMU are compared.

To test hypothesis 22, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 22 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to the degree to which a list of behaviors were exhibited by their mentor. Item IV-a revealed that group 4 (seniors) differed significantly from group 3 (juniors), at the $<.05$ level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis 22 was rejected.

23a. There will be no significant difference between classification when identification of events that hindered the mentor relationship are compared.

23b. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when the identification of events that helped the mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypotheses 23a and 23b, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 23 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to factors that helped or hindered their mentor relationship. Items V-a-3 (hindering behavior) revealed that group 3 (juniors) was significantly different from group 1 (freshmen); Item V-a-3, group 4 (seniors) was significantly different from group 1 (freshmen); (helping behavior) Item V-b-4 revealed group 3 (juniors) was significantly different from group 1 (freshmen) at the $<.05$ level of significance. Hypotheses 23a and 23b, therefore, was rejected.

24. There will be no significant difference among students according to race when the identification of events that led to the development of the mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 24, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 24 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to events that led to the development of their mentor relationship. Item VI-c revealed that group 2 (sophomores), was significantly different from group 4 (seniors); Item VI-d, group 2 (sophomores) was significantly differently from group 3 (juniors); and Item VI-d, group 2 (sophomores) was significantly different from group 4 (seniors) at the $<.05$ level of significance. Hypothesis 24, therefore, was rejected.

25. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when the identification of traits admired about mentors are compared.

To test hypothesis 25, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 25 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to what they admired most about their mentors. Item VII-d, group 2 (sophomores) was significantly different from group 1 (freshmen) at the $<.05$ level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis 25 rejected.

26. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when the identification of benefits gained from the relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 26, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 26 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to benefits gained from their mentor relationship. Item VIII-a, group 1 (freshmen) was significantly different from groups 2 and 4 (sophomores and seniors); Item VIII-a, group 3 (juniors) was significantly different from group 2 (sophomores); Item VIII-b, group 1 (freshmen) was significantly different from groups 2, 3 and 4 (sophomores, juniors and seniors); Item VIII-c, group 1 (freshmen) was significantly different from group 2 (sophomores); Item

VIII-d, group 1 (freshmen) was significantly different from groups 2 and 3 (sophomores and juniors); and Item VIII-d, group 4 (seniors) was significantly different from group 2 (sophomores), at the $<$ .05 level of significance. Hypothesis 26, therefore, was rejected.

27. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when the identification of qualities that a mentor should have are compared.

To test hypothesis 27, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 27 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to qualities that they felt their mentor should have. The comparison revealed no significant differences at the $<$.05 level. Hypothesis 27, therefore, was accepted.

28. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when the identification of qualities of their ideal mentor are compared.

To test hypothesis 28, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 28 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to significant qualities their ideal mentor should have. The comparison revealed no significant differences. Therefore, hypothesis 28 was accepted.

29. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when the identification of negative outcomes from the mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 29, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 29 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to negative outcome from their mentor relationships. Comparisons revealed no significant difference at the $<$ .05 level. Hypothesis 29, therefore, was accepted.

30. There will be no significant difference among students according to classification when the overall grade point averages are compared.

To test hypothesis 30, a group comparison was carried out among the means of four classification groups. Table 20 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to the identification of overall grade point averages. The comparison revealed no significant difference at the $<$ .05 level. Hypothesis 30, therefore, was accepted.

SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

31. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when their reasons for not having a mentor are compared.

To test hypothesis 31, a group comparison was carried out among the means of 10 college and school groups. Table 31 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to reasons why they did not have a mentor. The comparison revealed the following: Item II-c, group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) differed significantly from group 1 (Education), and Item II-d, groups 10, 2, 1 and 5 (Allied Health Sciences, Business and Industry, Education, and Pharmacy) differed significantly from group 3 (Arts and Sciences); Item II-e, group 5 (Pharmacy) differed significantly from groups 2, 1, 8, 3, 6 and 9 (Business and Industry, Education, Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Nursing), and group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture) differed significantly from group 9 (Nursing); Item II-i, group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture) differed significantly from groups 3 and 9 (Arts and Sciences and Nursing); group 2 (Business and Industry) differed significantly from group 3 (Arts and Sciences); and group 5 (Pharmacy) differed significantly from groups 3 and 9 (Arts and Sciences and Nursing). Item II-j, group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) differed significantly from group 9 (Nursing), and group 2 (Business and Industry) differed significantly from groups 3 and 9 (Arts and Sciences and Nursing). Item II-m, group 8 (Architecture) differed significantly from group 9 (Nursing); group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture) differed significantly from group 2 (Business and Industry); and group 2 (Business and Industry) differed significantly from group 9 (Nursing). Group 3 (Arts and Sciences) differed significantly from group 9 (Nursing). All of these are significant at the $<.05$ level. Hypothesis 31, therefore, was rejected.

32. There will be no significant difference among students according to school and college when the identification of behavior exhibited by mentors at FAMU are compared.

To test hypothesis 32, a group comparison was carried out among the means of ten school and college groups. Table 32 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to behavior that their mentors exhibited. The comparison revealed the following: Item IV-a, group 7 (Journalism) is significantly different from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Architecture); group 2 (Business and Industry) is significantly different from group 5 (Pharmacy); and group 1 (Education) is significantly different from group 5 (Pharmacy). Item IV-b, group 7 (Journalism) is significantly different from groups 3 and 4 (Arts and Sciences and Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture); group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) is significantly different from group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture); and group 2 (Business and Industry) is significantly different from group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture). All of these are significant at the $< .05$ level. Item IV-c, group 1 (Education) is significantly different from groups 3, 5 and 8 (Arts and Sciences, Pharmacy and Architecture); group 9 (Nursing) is significantly different from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Architecture); and group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) is significantly different from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Journalism). Item IV-d, group 7 (Journalism) is significantly different from group 3 (Arts and Sciences); group 2 (Business and Industry) is significantly different from group 3 (Arts and Sciences); and group 10 (Allied Health

Sciences) is significantly different from group 3 (Arts and Sciences). Group 6 (Engineering) is significantly different from groups 3, 4, 5 and 8 (Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy, and Architecture); and group 7 (Journalism) is significantly different from group 5 (Pharmacy). Item IV-f, group 6 (Engineering) is significantly different from groups 3, 4, 5 and 8 (Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture); group 7 (Journalism) is significantly different from groups 3, 4, 5, and 8 (Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture); and group 9 (Nursing) is significantly different from groups 4 and 5 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, and Pharmacy). Group 1 (Education) is significantly different from groups 4 and 5 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, and Pharmacy). Item IV-g, group 9 (Nursing) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture); group 1 (Education) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture); and group 6 (Engineering) is significantly different from group 8 (Nursing). Group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture); Item IV-h, group 7 (Journalism) is significantly different from groups 3, 4, 5, and 8 (Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy, and Architecture); and group 9 (Nursing) is significantly different from groups 4, 5, and 8 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy, and Architecture). Group 6 (Engineering) is significantly different from groups 4, 5 and 8 (Engineering Sciences, Technology, and Agriculture, Pharmacy and Architecture); Item IV-i, group 6 (Engineering) is significantly different from groups 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 , 8, 9 and 10 (Education, Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, Pharmacy, Journalism, Architecture, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences); and group 7 (Journalism) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture). Group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture); group 1 (Education) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture); and group 9 (Nursing) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture). Group 2 (Business and Industry) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture); group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) is significantly different from group 8 (Architecture). Item IV-j, group 7 (Journalism) is significantly different from group 3 (Arts and Sciences); group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture) is significantly different from group 3 (Arts and Sciences); and group 1 (Education) is significantly different from group 3 (Arts and Sciences). Group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) is significantly different from group 3 (Arts and Sciences); and group 9 (Nursing) is significantly different from group 3 (Arts and Sciences). Item IV-k, group 7 (Journalism) is significantly different from groups 3, 4, 5 and 8 (Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy, and Architecture); group 2 (Business and Industry) is significantly different from groups 4, 5, and 8 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy, and Architecture); and group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) is significantly different from groups 4, 5, and 8 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, Pharmacy and Architecture). Group 1 (Education) is significantly different from groups 4, 5, and 8 (Engineering Sciences, Technology, and Agriculture, Pharmacy, and Architecture). All of these groups were significantly different at the $<.05$ level. Hypothesis 32, therefore, was rejected.

33a. There will be no significant difference among schools and colleges when events that hindered the student-mentor relationship are compared.

33b. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when events that helped the mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 33a (hindering events) and 33b (helping events), a group comparison was carried out among the means of 10 school and college groups. Table 33 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to events that hindered and helped their mentor relationship. Comparisons revealed the following: (Hindered) Item V-a-1, group 2 (Business and Industry) significantly differed from groups 3 and 8 (Arts and Sciences, and Architecture). Item V-a-2, group 2 (Business and Industry) significantly differed from group 3 (Arts and Sciences); and Item V-a-3, group 2 (Business and Industry) significantly differed from groups 3, 6 and 8 (Arts and Sciences, Engineering, and Architecture). Group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from groups 6 and 8 (Engineering and Architecture); and group 5 (Pharmacy) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture). Group 1 (Education) significantly differed from groups 6 and 8 (Engineering and Architecture); and group 7 (journalism) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture). Group 9 (Nursing) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture). Item V-a-4, group 2 (Business and Industry) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture); and (Helped) Item V-b-1, group 1 (Education) significantly differed from groups 3 and 4 (Arts and Sciences, and Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture). Group 7 (Journalism) significantly differed from group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture); and group 6 (Engineering). Item V-b-4, group 1 (Education) significantly differed from group 3 (Arts and Sciences). All of these findings were significantly different at the <.05 level. Hypothesis 33a and 33b, therefore, were rejected.

34. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified events that led to the development of the mentor relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 34, a group comparison was carried out among the means of 10 school and college groups. Table 34 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to events that led to the development of their mentor relationship. The comparison revealed the following data: Item VI-a, group 1 (Education) significantly differed from group 2 (Business and Industry); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 2 (Business and Industry). Item VI-b, group 1 (Education) significantly differed from groups 2, 10, 5 and 8 (Business and Industry, Allied Health Sciences, Pharmacy and Architecture); and group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture) significantly differed from group 8 (architecture). Group 6 (Engineering) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 8

(Architecture). Group 7 (Journalism) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture); Item VI-c, group 9 (Nursing) significantly differed from groups 2 and 7 (Business and Industry, and Journalism); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 2 and 7 (Business and Industry, and Engineering). Group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from group 7 (Journalism); and group 1 (Education). Item VI-d, group 6 (Engineering) significantly differed from group 10 (Allied Health Sciences). Group 9 (Nursing) significantly differed from group 10 (Allied Health Sciences); and group 1 (Education) significantly differed from group 10 (Allied Health Sciences). Group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 10 (Allied Health Sciences). All of these findings were significantly different at the $<.05$ level. Hypothesis 34, therefore, was rejected.

35. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified traits that were admired about mentors are compared.

To test hypothesis 34, a group comparison was carried out among the means of 10 school and college groups. Table 35 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to traits that were admired about their mentors. The comparisons revealed the following: Item VII-a, group 6 (Engineering) significantly differed from groups 5 and 10 (Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences); and group 1 (Education) significantly differed from groups 2, 5, 8, and 10 (Business and Industry, Pharmacy, Architecture, and Allied Health Sciences). Item VII-b, group 6 (Engineering) significantly differed from groups 5, 8, and 10 (Pharmacy, Architecture, and Allied Health Sciences); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy). Group 1 (Education) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy). Item VII-c, group 9 (Nursing) significantly differed from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Architecture); and group 1 (Education) significantly differed from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Architecture). Group 6 (Engineering) significantly differed from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Architecture); and group 2 (Business and Industry) significantly differed from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Architecture). Group 7 (Journalism) significantly differed from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Architecture); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Architecture). Group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from groups 5 and 8 (Pharmacy and Architecture). Item VII-d, group 7 (Journalism) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture); and group 6 (Engineering) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture). Group 9 (Nursing) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture); and group 2 (Business and Industry) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture). Group 1 (Education) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture); and group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from group 8 (Architecture). Item VII-e, group 7 (Journalism) significantly differed from groups 2, 3, 4 and 5 (Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture, and Pharmacy); and group 6 (Engineering) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy). Group 9 (Nursing) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy; and group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy). Group 1

(Education) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy). All of these findings were significant at the $<.05$ level. Hypothesis 35, therefore, was rejected.

36. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified benefits gained from the relationship are compared.

To test hypothesis 36, a group comparison was carried out among the means of 10 college and school groups. Table 36 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to gains from mentor relationships. The comparisons revealed the following data: Item VIII-a, group 5 (Pharmacy) significantly differed from groups 1, 3 and 6 (Education Arts and Sciences, and Engineering); and group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1, 2, 3, and 6 (Education, Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, and Engineering). Item VIII-b, group 5 (Pharmacy) significantly differed from group 1 (Education); and group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from group 1 (Education). Group 7 (Nursing) significantly differed from group 1 (Education); and group 2 (Business and Industry) significantly differed from group 1 (Education). Item VIII-c, group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1, 2 and 9 (Education, Business and Industry, and Nursing); and group 7 (Journalism) significantly differed from groups 1 and 9 (Education and Nursing). Group 5 (Pharmacy) significantly differed from groups 1 and 9 (Education and Nursing); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1 and 9 (Education and Nursing). Item VIII-d, group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1, 2 and 9 (Education, Business and Industry, and Nursing). All of these findings were significantly different at the <05 level. Therefore, hypothesis 36 was rejected.

37. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified qualities that they feel a mentor should have are compared.

To test hypothesis 37, a group comparison was carried out among the means of 10 college and school groups. Table 37 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to qualities that their mentor should have. The comparisons revealed the following data: Item IX-a, group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 2 (Business and Industry); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 1 (Education). Group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy). Item IX-b, group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 10 (Allied Health Sciences); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 1 (Education). Group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 2 (Business and Industry); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy). Item IX-c, group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1, 2, and 5 (Education, Business and Industry, and Pharmacy). Item IX-d), group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1, 2 and 5 (Education, Business and

Industry, and Pharmacy). Item IX-e, group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 2 and 7 (Business and Industry, and Journalism); and group 8 (Architecture) significantly differed from groups 1, 2, 5, and 7 (Education, Business and Industry, Pharmacy, and Journalism). Item IX-g, group 8 (Architecture) significantly differed from group 2 (Business and Industry). Item IX-h, group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1, 2 and 5 (Education, Business and Industry, and Pharmacy). Item IX-i, group 8 (Architecture) significantly differed from group 1 (Education); and group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1 and 7 (Education and Journalism). Item IX-j, group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1, 2 and 5 (Education, Business and Industry, and Pharmacy). All of these findings were significant at the $<.05$ level. Hypothesis 37, therefore, was rejected.

38. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified qualities of their ideal mentor are compared.

To test hypothesis 38, a group comparison was carried out among the means of 10 school and college groups. Table 38 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to significant qualities of their ideal mentor. The comparisons revealed the following data; Item X-a, group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1 and 6 (Education and Engineering); and group 7 (Journalism) significantly differed from groups 1 and 6 (Education and Engineering). Group 5 (Pharmacy) significantly differed from group 1 (Education). Item X-b, group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 1 and 7 (Education and Journalism); and group 5 (Pharmacy) significantly differed from group 7 (Journalism). Group 10 (Allied Health Sciences) significantly differed from group 7 (Journalism); and group 4 (Engineering Sciences, Technology, and Agriculture) significantly differed from group 7 (Journalism). Item X-c, group 8 (Architecture) significantly differed from groups 1, 2 and 6 (Education, Business and Industry, and Engineering); and Item X-d, group 8 (Architecture) significantly differed from groups 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 (Education, Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, Pharmacy, Engineering, Journalism, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences). All of these findings were significant at the $<.05$ level. Therefore, hypothesis 38 was rejected.

39. There will be no significant difference among students according to schools and colleges when identified negative outcomes from mentor relationships are compared.

To test hypothesis 39, a group comparison was carried out among the means of 10 college and school groups. Table 39 contains a summary of the means derived from student responses to some negative outcomes from their mentor relationships. The comparisons revealed the following data: Item IX-a, group 9 (Nursing) significantly differed from groups 4 and 8 (Engineering Sciences, Technology, and Agriculture, and Architecture). These comparisons are significant at the $< .05$ level. Hypothesis 39, therefore, was rejected.

40. There will be no significant difference among students according to school and college when overall grade point averages are compared.

To test hypothesis 40, a group comparison was carried out among the means of 10 colleges and schools. Table 40 contains a summary of the means derived from the student responses to identification of their overall grade point averages. The comparisons revealed the following data: Item XII-a, group 1 (Education) significantly differed from groups 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 10 (Business and Industry, Arts and Sciences, Pharmacy, Engineering, Journalism, and Allied Health Sciences). Item XII-a, group 8 (Architecture) significantly differed from groups 5 and 10 (Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences); and Item XII-a, group 2 (Business and Industry) significantly differed from group 5 (Pharmacy). Item XII-a, group 3 (Arts and Sciences) significantly differed from groups 5 and 10 (Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences. All of these comparisons are significant at the $< .05$ level. Hypothesis 40, therefore, was rejected.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A summary of the findings shows the following: Male and female students differed significantly, but students by race did not differ significantly. Students by classification differed significantly, but students by school and colleges did not differ significantly when they identified their reasons for not having a mentor relationship at FAMU.

Male and female students differed significantly, students by race differed significantly, students by classification differed significantly, and students by school and colleges differed significantly when they identified behaviors exhibited by their mentor at FAMU.

Male and female students differed significantly, students by race differed significantly, students by classification differed significantly, and students by schools and colleges differed significantly when they identified events that hindered or helped the mentor relationship.

Male and female students did not differ significantly, students by race differed significantly, students by classification differed significantly, and students by schools and colleges differed significantly when they identified events that led to the development of a mentor relationship.

Male and female students differed significantly, students by race differed significantly, and students by schools and colleges differed significantly when they identified traits that were admired about their mentor. Although male and female students did not differ significantly, students by race differed significantly, students by classification differed significantly, and students by classification differed significantly, and students by schools and colleges differed significantly when they identified benefits gained from their mentor relationship.

Male and female students did not differ significantly, students by race did not differ significantly, students by classification did not differ significantly, but students by schools and colleges differed significantly when they identified qualities that they felt a mentor should have.

Although students by classification did not differ significantly, male and female students differed significantly, students by race differed significantly, and students in schools and colleges differed significantly when they identified qualities of their ideal mentor.

Male and female students differed significantly, students by race differed significantly, students by schools and colleges differed significantly, but students by classification did not differ when they identified negative outcomes from their mentor relationship.

Although male and female students did not differ significantly, students by race differed significantly, students by classification differed significantly, and students by schools and colleges differed significantly when they identified their overall grade point average.

An analysis of the data comparing Black student perceptions of their mentor relationships with those of Hispanic and white students suggests some puzzling implications. This is an important issue, since FAMU is a historically black institution. The data showed the following outcomes:

Black Students

1. Black students differed significantly from Hispanic students when they indicated that they gained interpersonal skills from their mentor. (How to get along with others.)
2. Black students differed significantly from white students when they identified determination as a benefit gained from their mentor relationship.
3. Black students differed significantly from white students when they identified a desire to achieve as an outcome of their mentor relationship.
4. Black students differed significantly from white students when they identified a desire to set goals for themselves as a benefit gained from their mentor relationship.
5. Black students differed significantly from white students when they identified academic growth as a benefit gained from their mentor relationship.
6. Black students differed significantly from white students when they identified a strong self-concept as a quality that their ideal mentor should have.
7. Black students differed significantly from white students when they identified illness of the mentor as a negative outcome of their mentor relationship.

White Students

White students showed greater mean scores than Black students when they responded to the items below:

1. My mentor is sensitive to the experiences that I brought to FAMU.
2. My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about personal concerns.
3. My mentor introduces me to influential people and informs me of opportunities which enhance my career.
4. Moodiness hindered the development of my mentor relationship.
5. The lack of punctual habits on the part of my mentor hindered the development of my mentor/protege relationship.
6. The lack of punctual habits on the part of the protege hindered the relationship.
7. Helpfulness on the part of the mentor facilitated the mentor/protege relationship.
8. My mentor helped me to determine if I were in the right field (career).
9. My mentor helped me when I needed advice concerning my financial problems (food, books, car, rent, etc.).
10. I admire courage in my mentor.
11. I admire leadership in my mentor.
12. I admire good teaching skills in my mentor.
13. What is your grade point average?

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study points out specific student perceptions of mentor relationships at FAMU. On the basis of the findings of this study, I make the following recommendations:

1. That a proposal be written for a grant to secure funds to organize and operate several mentoring programs.

2. That mentoring programs be planned and executed at the freshmen and sophomore levels as part of a larger retention effort.

3. That each mentor program be structured so that one group of mentees will be part of a controlled group, and the other mentees would function as the experimental group.

4. That small mentoring programs be put into operation in order to accommodate the racial mixture of students at FAMU. This will help to bring those minorities into the mainstream of campus life.

5. That a review of these findings be made to determine the need for a mentoring program in the various schools and colleges.

REFERENCES

JOURNALS

Adkinson, R., "Selecting the Best Teacher Mentor Candidates - A Process that Worked," *THRUST* 14: 26+, AP/May 1985.

Alleman, E., Cochran, J., Doverspike, J., and Newman, I., "Enriching Mentoring Relationships," *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 62, 329-332 (February, 1984).

Anderson, C. and Devanna, M.A., "Mentors: Can They Help Women Get Ahead?" *Career Development Activities*, 1981, 2 (2), 5-8.

Auster, D., "Mentors and Proteges Power Dependet Dyads." *SOCIOLOGICAL INQUIRY*, vol, 54, n.2, 984, pp. 142-153.

Austin, A.W., "Involvement: Cornerstone of Excellence," *CHANGE*, 17, 24-38.

Baum, Michael C. and Lamb, Douglas H., "A Comparison of the Concerns Presented by Black and White Students to a University Counseling Center," *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1983, 127-131.

Beard, Elizabeth M. and Densem, Prue A. (1986), "LAMP: The Development and Implementation of a Programme of Provisions for High School Students with Special Abilities," *Gifted Education International*, 4(2), 111-115.

Bensahel, J.G. (1977), "Let Your Protege Make His/Her Own Way," *International Management*, 32: N.5, pp. 44-46.

Berger Diane and Perino, James, "Sharing, Caring Growing: The Mentor Teacher Program," *THRUST*, 15: 38-39, 1986.

Bolton, E.A., "Conceptual Analysis of the Mentor Relationship in the Career Development of Women," *Adult Education*, 1980, 30, 190-207.

Borman, Christopher and Colson, Sharon, (1984, March). "Mentoring--An Effective Career Guidance Technique," *The Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, 32(3), 192-196.

Bova, B.M. and Phillips, R.R., (1984), "Mentoring as a Learning Experience for Adults," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 36, N.3, pp. 16-20, May/Je/84.

Boston, Bruce, (1976), *The Sorcerer's Apprentice*: "A Case Study on the Role of the Mentor," Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Boston, B.O., *The Sorcerer's Apprentice*: A CAse Study in the Role of the Mentor. (1976) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED. 126 671.)

Brigman, S.L., Kuh, G.D., and Stager, S.F. (1982), "Those who choose to leave: Why students voluntarily withdraw from college." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 45(3), 3-8, 1982.

Burrell, Leon F. and Trombley, Toni B., "Academic Advising with Minority Students on Predominantly White Campuses," Journal of College Student Personnel, 1983, 121-126.

Burton, A., "The Mentoring Dynamic in the Therapeutic Transformation," American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1977, 37, 115-122.

Clark, V. and Thompson, C.K., "Identifying Mentors through an Adopt-a-Professional/Adopt-a-Student Project," Ill. Teacher Home Economic, 28: 203-4, My/Je 1985.

Clemson, R.L. (1985), The Dynamics of Mentoring in Higher Education: Experiences of department chairs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

Collins, E. and Scott, P., "Everyone who makes it has a Mentor," Harvard Business Review, July-Aug 1978, pp. 89-101.

Cooper, Constance Carter, (1985), "Mentors Can Serve Black Youth in Many Ways," Journal of Negro Education, 54(2), 115-116.

Cosgrove, Thomas J., "The Effects of Participing in mentoring - Transcript program on Freshmen," Journal of College Student Personnel; March V.27, N.2: 119-124.

Cox, Linda, Adaptive Mentoring, G/C/T; May/July: 54-56, 1984.

Cox, June and Daniel, Neil, The Role of the Mentor, G/C/T; Sept-Oct: 54-61, 1983.

Croft, J., "In Praise of Mentors," School Musician, 55-56, Ag/S 1984.

Cronan, T., Hillix and others, "Students' views of Mentors in Psychology Graduate Training," Teach. of Psychol. 13: 123-7, Oct. '86.

Daloz, Laurent A. (1983, September), "Mentors, Teachers Who Make a Difference," Change, 15, pp. 24-27.

Darling, Lu Ann W., "Self-Mentoring Strolegies," The Journal of Nursing Administration: April, V.15, N.4: 42-43, 1985.

Darling, Lu Ann W., "Mentors and Mentoring," The Journal of Nursing Administration, March, V. 15 N.3: 42-43, 1985.

Diamond, Helen, "Husband as Mentor: 'You can do it!': An interview with Stella Feuers." Educational Horizons: Winter, V.57, N.2: 90-96, 1978-79.

"Do Mentors Really Make a Difference?" Glamour , 83-116, Je '85.

Editorial Staff, California State Department of Education: *California Mentor Teacher Program Advisory*, California State Department of Education; ERIC 241 473: pp 14, 1983.

Elwood, William R., "The Necessity of the faculty mentor in the development of the artist-scholar." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Theater Association, Dallas (August 9-12); ERIC ED 212012; 7 pp, 1981.

Edlind, E.P. and Haensly, "Gifts of Mentorships," *Gifted Child*. Q., 29: 55-60, Sept. '85.

Erikson, E.H. (1959), *Identity and the Life Cycle*. Psychological Issues Monograph #1, New York: International University Press.

Erickson, K.A., and Pitner, N.J., "The Mentor Concept is Alive and Well," *NASSP Bulletin*: December, V.64: 8-13, 1980.

Erkut, S., and Mokros, J.R., "Professors as Models and Mentors for College Students," *Amer. Educ. Res.*, 21:339-417, Summer '86.

Farris, R., and Ragan, L. (1981), "Importance of Mentor-Protege Relationship to the Upward Mobility of the Female Executive," *Mid-South Business Journal*, I(4), 24-28.

Frey, B.R. and Noller, R.B., "Mentoring a Promise for the Future," *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 20:No. 1, 49-51, '86.

Fagan, M. and Fagan, P., "Mentoring among Nurses," *Nursing and Health Care*, Feb. 1983, pp. 77-82.

Fagan, M. and Walter, G., "Mentoring Among Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research*, 76:N.2, 1982, pp. 113-118.

Fitt, L.W. and Newton, D.A., "When the Mentor is a Man and the Protege a Woman," *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, V.59 N.2: 56, 58, 60, 1981.

Frey, Barbara R. and Noller, Ruth B., (1983), "Mentoring: A Legacy of Success," *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 17(1), 60-64.

Funk, Fenchon F., Long, Bruce and others, "The cooperating teacher as most significant other: A competent humonist." *Action In Teacher Education*; Fall, V. 4 N.2:57-64, 1982.

Galvez-Hjornevik, Celta, *Mentoring: A Review of the Literature with a Focus on Teaching*. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, the University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, 78712; 99 pp., 1985.

Gardner, John N., "Developing Faculty as Facilitators and Mentors." *New Directions for Student Services*; V.14; 67-80, 1981.

Gehrke, N. and Kay, R.S., "The Socialization of Beginning Teachers Through Mentor Protege Relationships," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35:No. 3, 1984 pp. 21-24.

George, P., and Kummerow, J., "Mentoring for Career Women," Training, HRD, February 1981, 44-49.

Gerstein, Martin. (1985, October). "Mentoring: An Age Old Practice in a Knowledge-Based Society." Journal of Counseling and Development, 64, 156-157.

Glennen, R.E., and Barley, D.M., (1985). "Reducation of attrition through intrusive advising." NASP Journal, 22, 10-14.

Glover, William Charles Jr., (1986), Mentors and fathers: A Study of Male Developmental Relationships. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Wright Institute (Berkeley), 209 pp., Adult Development.

Godley, L.B. and Others, "The Teacher Consultant Role: Impact on the Profession." ACTION Trach. Education, 8:65-73, Winter '86-87. Voice of Experience. AMER. TEACHER, 71:2, Apr. '87.

Gould, R., Transformations: Growth and Change in Adult Life. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978.

Gould, R., "The Phases of Adult Life: A STudy in Development Psychology," The American Journal of Psychology, November 1972, 129, 5.

Gray, W.A. and Rogers, D., "Mentor Directed Enrichment Projects for Gifted Elementary School Pupils. Rational, Guidelines and Benefits." Special Education in Canada, 56:N.2, pp.24-32.

Gray, W.A., "Mentoring Gifted, Talented, Creative Students on an Initial Student Teaching Practicum: Guidelines and Benefits." Gifted Educational International, 2, 2 (1984b): 121-128.

Gray, W.A., "A Helping Relationship Model for Enabling Mentors to Work Successfully with Proteges: Guidelines and Benefits," In press for Proceedings of the XXIII International Congress of Psychology, Acapulco, 1984a.

Halatin, T.J., and Knotts, R.R. (1968), "Becomming a Mentor: Are the risk worth the rewards?" Supervisory Management, 27(2), 27-29.

Halcomb, R., "Mentors and the Successful Women," Across the Board, 1980, 17, 13-17.

Hall, R.M., and Sandler, B.R. (1983). "Academic mentoring for women students and faculty: A new look at and old way to get ahead." Monographs of the Project on the Status and Education of Women of the American Association of Colleges.

Haring-Hidore, Marilyn, (Fall, 1986), "Developing Mentoring Programs for Retention of High-Risk Students," Reading Improvement 23(3), 239-244.

Harris, Rosemary A., (May/June, 1984), "Mentorship for the Gifted: Recollections of a First Year Experience." G/C/T, 8-9.

Harris, R.A., "The In/Out Approach to Locating Mentors for Gifted Programs." G/C/T No. 37:10-11 Mar/Ap '85.

Hawk, P., "Beginning Teacher Programs: Benefits for the Experienced Educator," Action Teacher Education, Vol. 8:59-63, Winter '86-87.

Hawk, P., "Mentors Keep Interns on Course," American Teacher, 71:2 March '87.

Hegler, K.L., "Support Teacher: A Key Role for Educational Progress," Delta Kappan Gamma Bull. 52: 43-46, Summer '86.

Hellman, L. (1973); Pentimento, Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co.

Hetherington, C. and others, "Womentoring: A Cross-Cultural Perspective (Black Women) as Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education," Nat'l. Assoc. Women Deans, Adm., Couns, 49:12-15, Fall '85.

Higgerson, M.L. (1985), "Understanding Why Students Voluntarily Withdraw from College," NASP Journal, 22, 15-21.

Hirschorn, Michael W., "Programs for Potential High School Dropout Gives Them Route to College," Chronical of Higher Education, Vol. XXXIV, No. 13, Nov. 25, 1987, pp-A29-A30.

Hughes, Marvalene, "Black Students' Participation in Higher Education," Journal of College Student Personnel, 1987, 532-545.

Hunt, D.M., and Michael C., "Mentorship: A Career Training and Development Tool," Academy of Management Review, July 1983, 8, 475-485.

Jevnikar, J., "Learning While You Teach: Being an Artist-Mentor," American Artist 50: 10+ Ag. '86.

Kaufmann, F.A., Harrel, G., Milam, C.P., Wollverton, N., and Miller, J. (1986, May), "The Nature, Role, and Influence of Mentors in the Lives of Gifted Adults," Jounal of Counseling and Development, 64, 576-578.

Keating, J., "The Religion Teacher as Mentor Friend," Momentum 15:31-32, D '84.

Keele, R.L. and M. De La Mare-Schaefer. "So What Do You Do Now That You Don't Have A Mentor?" Jrl of Natl Assoc Women Deans Adm Couns 47:36-34, Spr. '84.

Klauss, R., "Formalized Mentor Relationships for Management and Development Programs in the Federal Government," Public Administration Review, March 1979, 489-496.

Klauss, R., "The Mentors," Public Management, March 1979, 2-16.

Kram, K.E. (1985), "Improving the Mentoring Process," Training and Development Journal, 39:(4), pp. 40-43.

Kran, K.E., "Phases of the Mentor Relationship," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1983, p. 26.

Kupp, J.A. (1984), "Mentor and Protege Perceptions of Mentoring Relationships in an Elementary and Secondary School in Connecticut." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. Adm Couns. 50:8-13, Fall '86.

Lowney, R.G., "Mentor Teachers: The California Model," Phi Delta Kappa (Fast back) No. 247-30, '87.

Lambert, D., and Lambert, L., "Mentor Teachers as Change Facillators," Thrust, 14:28-32 AP/M '85.

McDraffrey, S.S. and Miller, T.K., "Mentoring: An Approach to Academics," Student Development Practice Strategies for Making a Difference, (Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas, 1980.)

McNeer, E.J. (1982), "The Role of Mentoring in the Career Development of Women Administrators in Higher Education," Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1981. Abstracts International, 42, 2945 A.

McWilliams, R.S. and Raines, H.A., "Mentors Presence," New York Times Magazine, p. 46, Jl. 20, '86.

"Mentors Can Save Black Youth in Many Ways," J. Negro Education, 54-115-116, Spr. '85.

"Mentorships for the Gifted and Talented," (1985), ERIC Digest, Reston, Virginia: Clearinghouse on the Handicapped and Gifted Children.

Merriam, Sharon, (1983, Spring), "Mentors and Proteges: A Critical Review of the Literature," Adult Education Quarterly, 33(3), 161-173.

Miller, J.P., "The Director as Mentor: Bringing up Teachers," Child Care Inf. Exch No. 54-43-5, Mr. '87, pp.305-C 5361.

Mirriam, S. (1983), "Mentors and Proteges: A Critical Review of the Literature," Adult Education Quarterly, 33(3), 161-175.

Moore, D.M., and Sangaria, M., "Mobility and Mentering Indications from a Study of Women Administrators," ERIC Clearing House, ED. 177-975, 1979.

Moore, K.M., and Salembene, A.M. (1981), "The Dynamics of Mentor Protege Relationships," Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 2, 51-64.

Morehead, M. and William, J., "Mentoring - The Administrator's Disappointing Art," TRUST, 16:39 N/D '86.

Morten, George and Atkinson, Donald R., "Minority Identity Development and Preference for Counselor Race," Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 52, No. 2, 1983, pp. 156-161.

Nettles, Michael T. and Johnson, Janet R., "Race, Sex and Other Factors as Determinants of College Students' Socialization," Journal of College Student Personnel, 1987, 512-532.

Obler, Martin; Francis, Kim; and Wishengrad, Robyn, (1977, Jan/Feb.), "Combining of Traditional Counseling, Instruction, and Mentoring Functions with Academically Deficient College Freshmen." The Journal of Educational Research, 79, 141-147.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1983), "Establishing a Formalized Mentoring Program," Training and Development Journal, 37: No. 2, 38-42.

Piemme, J.A., "Developing the Nurse Preceptor..." J. Contin Educa Nurse, 17: 186-9 N/D '86.

Prehm, H.J. and Isoocson, L.S., "Mentorship: Student and Faculty Perspectives," Teach. Educ. Spec. Educ., 8:12-16, Winter '85.

Rawles, B., "The Influence of a Mentor on the Level of Self Actualization of American Scientists," Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1980.

Rawlins, Melanie E. and Rawlins, Larry, (1983, October), "Mentoring and Networking for Helping Professionals," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 116-118.

Reich, Murray H., "The Mentor Connection," Personnel, Feb., V. 63, No. 2:50-56, 1986.

Roche, B.R. (1979), "Much Ado About Mentors," Harvard Business Review, 57(1), 14-28.

Schmidt, J.A., and Wolfe, J.S. (1980), "The Mentor Partnership: Discovery of Professionalism," NASPA, 17(3), 45-51.

Shapiro, E.C., Hazeltine, F.P., and Rowe, M.P., (1978), "Moving Up: Role Models, Mentors and the Patron System," Sloan Management Review, 19(3), 51-58.
Adm Couns 50:8-13, Fall '86.

Swobada, M.J. and Miller, S.B., "Networking-Mentoring Career Strategy of Women in Academic Administration," Journal Natl Assoc Women Deans Adm Couns 50:8-13, Fall '86.

Thies, L., Sprinthall, "A Collaborative Approach for Mentor Training: A Working Model," J. Teacher Education, 37:13-30, N/D '86.

Turkel, Susan B., and Abramson, Theodore, (1986, October), "Peer Tutoring and Mentoring as a Drop-out Prevention Strategy," *The Clearing House for the Contemporary Education in Middle and Secondary Schools*, 60(2), 68-71.

Veenman, S., "Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers," *Review of Educational Research*, 45: No. 2, 1984, pp. 143-178.

Wagner, L.A. (1985), "Ambiguities and Possibilities in California's Mentor Teacher Program," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. (3), 23-29.

Weber, J. (1985), "Thoughts and Actions on Student Retention," *Innovation Abstracts*, 7(30).

Webster, D.W., Sedlacek, W. and Miyores, J., "A Comparison of Problems Perceived by Minority and White University Students," *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1979, 20, 165-170.

Wilson, David, "Black Faculty...A Key to Black Student Retention," *Basic Issues In Higher Education*, Vol. 4, No. 21, Feb. 1, 1988, pp. 12-13.

REFERENCE

BOOKS

Astin, A.W., Preventing Students from Dropping Out. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1977.

Beal, P.E. and Noel, L., What Works in Student Retention. Boulder, Colorado, NCHEM, 1979.

Bova, B.M., and Phillips, R.R. (1981), The Mentor Relationship: A Study of mentor and proteges in business and academia. Washington, D.C.: NIE.

Chickering, Arthur W., Education and Identity, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.

Clawson, J., "Mentoring in Managerial Careers," Work, Family and the Career, C. Brooklyn Derr (ed.), New York: Praeger, 1980, 144-165.

Clawson, J. (1985). In C.B. Derr (Ed.), Work, Family and the Career. New York: Praeger.

Daloz, Laurent A. (1986). Effective Teaching and Mentoring. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Danish, S.J., and Canter, K.R. (1978). "Intervention and evaluation: Two sides of the same community coin." In LaGoldman (ed.), Research methods for counselors Practical approaches in field settings (pp. 343-359). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Fleming, Jacqueline, Blacks In College, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1984.

Kanigel, Robert. Apprentice to Genius - The Making of a Scientific Dynasty. MacMillan Publishing Co., New York, 1986.

Kran, K., Mentoring at Work Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life. Glenview, Ill., Scott, Foresman & Company, 1985.

Kram, K., Mentoring Process at work: Developmental Relationships in Managerial Careers. Doctoral Dissertation. Yale University, 1980.

Lenning, O.T., Beal, P.E. and Saver, K., "Retention and Attrition: Evidence for Action and Research," Boulder, Colorado, NCHMS, 1980.

Levinson, D. and others, Seasons of a Man's Life. New York, Knopf, 1978.

Mead, M. (1972), Blackberry Winter, New York: Morrow, Inc.

Melia, Jinx. (1980). Mentoring: What It Is and Why, Boulder, Colorado: C&B Publishing Co.

Pedersen, P.P., Draguns, J.G., Lonner, W.J. and Trimble, J.E., Eds., Counseling Across Cultures, Second Edition, Hawaii: The University Press of Hawaii, 1981.

Phillips-Jones, Linda. (1982). Mentors and Proteges. New York: ARbor House.

Schein, E.H., Career Dynamics: Matching Individual and Organizational needs.... Reading, Pa. Addison-Wesley, 1978.

Sheehy, G., "Pathfinders Overcoming the Crisis of Adult Life and Finding Your Own Path to Well Being." New York, Bantam Books, 1981.

Stikes, C. Scully, Black Students In Higher Education, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984.

Tinto, Vincent, Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Torrance, E.P. 1984). Mentor Relationships: How They Aid Creative Achievement, Endure, Change and Die. New York: Bearly Limited.

Zey, M. 1984). The Mentor Connection. Homewood, Illinois: Dow-Jones-Irwin.

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS

Alleman, E., "Mentoring Relationships in Organizations: Behavior, Personality Characteristics, and Interpersonal Perceptions," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Akron, 1982.

Alleman, E. & Newman, I. (1984, April). "Interpersonal Perceptions in Mentoring Relationships." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Bowen, Donald D., "Identification is to Mentoring as Infatuation is to Love," address presented at the National Academy of Management Meetings, Dallas, TX, August 1983.

Bova, B.M. & Phillip, R.R. (1982, November). "The Mentoring Relationship as an Educational Experience." Paper presented at the National Conference of the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., San Antonio, TX.

Cain, R.A., "Critical Incidents and Critical Requirements of Mentoring - Implications for Inservice Training." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College. 1977.

Davis, R., & Garrison, P. (1979). "Mentoring: In Search of a Taxonomy." Unpublished master's thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dockery, Linda Benge, "An exploration of mentorship between adults in the public schools." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 125 pp., 1985.

Hanson, Patricia Ann, "Protege perceptions of the mentor-protege relationship: Its complementary nature and developmental tasks." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 300 pp., 1983.

Hill, Denise Lynn, "A study of mentor and mentor-type relationships of first-year law students at the Florida State University." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 174 pp., 1985.

Jenkins, Sandra Yvonne, "Gender differences in graduate student relationships with their major faculty advisors." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 99 pp., 1985.

Kammer, Carol Highsmith, "The relationship of managerial achievement to mentorship and managerial education." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 186 pp., 1985.

Katz, Elizabeth A., "Women in professional training: A study of the influence of mentors and sex ratio." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles, 159 pp., 1980.

Kelly, Kenneth Edward, "The initiation of protege mentor relationships among student affairs professionals in Virginia institutions of higher education." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, George Washington University, 1982.

Kremgold-Barrett, Anita, "Women mentoring women in an academic nursing faculty." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University, 301pp., 1986.

Leizear, Jane Leffingwell, "The incidence and influence of mentorship in the career development of upper level women administrators in public school systems in Texas." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A&M University, 101pp., 1984.

Lewis, Brenda Neumon, "Black female administrators in academia: A descriptive analysis of their career development and use of mentors." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 173 pp., 1985.

McCallum, Charles J., "The relationship of perceived instructional mentor influence to student educational development." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tulsa; 125 pp., 1980.

McEnery, Jean Marie Navalinsky, "Factors and processes in developing subordinates: A description of the role and results of mentoring in a health care organization." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Wayne State University, 132 pp., 1982.

Macey, Mary Jane Capps, "A study of faculty protege-mentor relationship as a method for faculty development in schools of nursing." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, George Peabo College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, 85 pp., 1985.

Malone, B.L., "Relationship of black female administrators' mentoring experience and career satisfaction." (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1982.) Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 558 B.

Missirian, A.K., "The Process of Mentoring in the Career Development of Female Managers." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1980.

Pierce, C.A., "Mentoring, Gender, and Attainment." The Professional Development of Academic Psychologists. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1983.

Phillips, L.L., "Mentoring and Proteges: A Study of the Career Development of Women Managers and Executives in Business and Industry." (Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1977.) Dissertation Abstract International, 38, 6414-6415-A.

Schrader, E.M. 1980). "Personality characteristics of woman-to-woman mentor in the career arena." (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1980.) Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 404B.

UNPUBLISHED PAPERS

"Returning Adult Students' Program: Removing Barriers for Adult Students." Ms. K. Jane Adcock, Director of Career Development and Placement, and Ms. Linda Newby, University Division Counselor, Indiana University at Kokomo, Kokomo, Indiana. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Mentoring: A strategy for the underachieving student - enchancing self-concept." Dr. Helene Aiello, Guidance Counselor, Fairfax County Public Schools, Fairfax, Virginia. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Development of a Mentoring Program in Response to Needs of Mentees." Ms. Lucile Chambers Armstrong, RN, MSN, Assistant Dean, and Ms. Gail Appiani Lamb, MA, NCC, Director of Student Affairs, Mennonite College of Nursing, Bloomington, Illinois. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Campus Connections: A College Course Infuses a Campus-Wide Mentoring Program." Ms. Lee Twyman-Arthur, Chairperson, Counseling Services Department, School of Business Careers, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, Rochester, New York. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Mentoring Process Used by Black Faculty Members in Schools of Nursing." Dr. Sallie Tucker-Allen, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois, Ms. Ruby Steele, RN, Webster University, St. Louis, Missouri, Ms. Sonia Baker, MA, RN, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Illinois. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Mentoring in Secondary Education." Dr. Nathan T. Avani, College Coordinator, Student Mentoring Program, Lehman College, The City University of New York, Bronx, New York. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Mentoring Women: From College to Career." Dr. Annette Bennington McElhiney, Institute for Women's Studies and Services, Metropolitan State College, Denver, Colorado. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Conceptualization of the MODELS toward Success Program." Ms. Yolanda Brooks, Coordinator, and Ms. Andrea Rice, Assistant Coordinator, MODELS Program, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Panel Discussion: The Mentor/Student Relationship. Dr. Anne R. Bertholf, Associate Dean; Dr. Jacke Rose; and Dr. Renee Walker, Empire State College, Niagra Frontier Regional Center, Buffalo, New York. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Puente Project: Mentoring at Evergreen Valley College." Mr. Mauro Chavez, Coordinator, and Ms. Margarita Maestas Flores, Mentor Liaison/Recruiter, Puente Project, Evergreen Valley College, San Jose, California. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Ohio State University: Graduate School Summer Research Opportunity Program." Dr. Jean D. Dickerscheid, Associate Dean; Ms. N. Jane Fullerton and Ms. Susan K. Saravalli, Graduate Administrative Associates, Graduate School, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Cosumnes River College Mentor Program." Ms. Eula Dean and Ms. Jean B. Harris, Coordinators, Mentor Program, and Mr. Steven Leake, Transfer Program, Consumnes River College, Sacramentor, California. A paper

presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Minority Mentoring Program." Dr. Diane Dillard, Director, Office of ACCESS, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Collaborative Model for Mentoring In-Service Professionals Educators: Applications at the Master's and Associate Degree Levels." Dr. Timothy J. Duszynski, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Charles Stewart Mott Community College, Flint, Michigan. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Role Model/Mentor Program." Ms. Melissa Exum, Coordinator, Role Model/ Mentor Program, and Mrs. Sadie Fletcher, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Maryland. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Expanding the Mentoring Process to Benefit the Nontraditional Student." Dr. Daniel J. Fields, Assistant Professor, Industrial Technology Department, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan, and Ms. Linda A. Henderson, Vice President, The Transition Team, Ann Arbor, Michigan. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Flanning, Rita Rice and Jenkins, Vivian Y., "An investigation of the interpersonal aspects of the mentor-protege relationship." Paper presented for the Association for Women in Psychology, Seattle, WA (March 1983); 20 pp., 1983.

"Foundations of a Clinically Guided Model for Training Academic Mentors." Dr. Kipling D. Forbes, Counselor, The Center for Individual and Family Services, Mansfield, Ohio. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Puente Project: A Writing/Counseling/Mentoring Program for Mexican American Community College Students." Mr. Felix Galaviz and Ms. Patricia McGrath, Co-Directors, Puente Project, University of California, California Community Colleges, Berkeley, California. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Quality Education for Minorities (QEM) Project." Mr. Harold C. Haizlip, Executive Director, Quality Education for Minorities Project, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Successful Faculty Mentoring with Native American Women Students." Dr. Susanna A. Hayes, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"South Mountain Community College Presents the Mentor Program." Ms. RaNae Ilealy, Director, Ford/Transfer Program, South Mountain Community College, Phoenix, Arizonia. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Black Students-Black Alumni-A Perfect Match." Ms. Lola M. Jones, Coordinator, Comprehensive Studies Mentorship Program, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Community Outreach in the Mentoring of Minority Students on a Regional Campus." Dr. Robert M. Kahn, Associate Professor, Political Science, Ohio State University at Mansfield, Mansfield, Ohio. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Student Volunteer Mentors Get Results." Dr. E. Jean King, Admissions Counselor, Office of Admissions, Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Marsicano, H.E. (1981, March). "Role of Mentors in Developing Careers: Do Women need Mentors?" Paper presented at West Virginia University Council of Women's Concerns, Morgantown, WV.

"Knowing Where You're Going Minority Achievement Program." Ms. Carol Morrison, Assistant Director, and Ms. Dorothy Echols, Director, Cooperative Education, Ramapo College of New Jersey, Mahwah, New Jersey. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Metas Model: A Successful Mentoring Program." Dr. Louis C. Murillo, Dean of Business, Arts, and Sciences, Contra Costa College, San Pablo, California. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Nontraditional Student Retention Program." Dr. Harry P. Muir, Jr., East Texas State University, Texarkana, Texas. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Mentoring: Recruiting and Training Faculty at a Research University." Dr. Paul McKenna, Associate Director, Center for Faculty/Staff Development, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conneticut. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Ostereicher, M.H. (1985, August). "Interactive Student Learning: An Interim Report on a Mentoring Project." Paper presented at the Spring Conference of the National Teachers of English, Houston, Texas.

Queralt, M. (1982). "The Role of the Mentor in the Career Development of University Faculty Members and Academic Administrators." Paper presented at the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Indianapolis, IN.

Reohr, J.R. (1981, November). "Mentor and College Relationships in Academia." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Studies Association.

"Major Techniques in the Mentor/Mentee Relationship." Dr. Hope B. Richardson, Assistant Professor, Bronx Community College, Bronx, New York. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Schockett, M.R., Yoshimura, E., Beyord-Taylor, K. and Haring, M.J. (1983). "Proposed Model of Mentoring." A paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Anaheim, California.

"Mentoring: A Necessary Ingredient for Young Single Parents." Ms. Mary H. Smarr, Coordinator, Young Single Parents Project, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. - Decatur Alumnae Chapter, Stone Mountain, Georgia. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"University Mentor Program: Addressing the Retention of Talented Minority Students." Dr. John Staley, Master of Cora P. Maloney College, and Ms. Rowena Adams-Jones, Counseling Psychologist, Cora P. Maloney College, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Mentoring Dynamic in Minority Recruiting and Retention: California State University Experience." Dr. Steve D. Ugbah, Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing, and Mr. Charles Ratliss, Director, EOP, California State University at Hayward, Hayward, California. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Wagner, L., "Evaluation Issues in California's Mentor Teacher Program Where Can We Go From Here?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association. Chicago, 1985.

"Program to Increase Minorities in Business (PIMIB) Task Force - Minorities in Management Study." Mr. Donald Williams, Sr., Director, Minority Business Education Center, Grand Valley State College, Allendale, Michigan. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

"Enhancing Voluntary Student Participation in Mentor Programs." Ms. Eunice D. Williams, Counselor/Coordinator of Minority Services, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York. A paper presented at a National Conference on Mentoring Minority, Women, Non-traditional and Handicapped Students, April 18, 1988, at Western Michigan University, in Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Tanner, C.K. and Ebers, S.M., "Evaluation of Beginning Teachers in a Performance-Based Certification Program." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, ILL 1985.

APPENDIX

A MENTORING QUESTIONNAIRE

MAJOR: ____________________

SEX: Male ( ) Female ( )

RACE: ____________________
(Optional)

Asian Hispanic
Black White

FRESHMAN _____
SOPHOMORE _____
JUNIOR _____
SENIOR _____

DIRECTION: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS CAREFULLY AS THEY WILL HELP YOU TO UNDERSTAND AND BE ABLE TO RESPOND TO THE QUESTIONS.

DEFINITIONS

Mentor: The educational mentor is one who guides, counsels, supports, shares, models, and welcomes the protege' into the professional world.

Protege': One whose welfare or career is promoted by an influential person.

---

1. BASED ON THE DEFINITIONS GIVEN, HAVE YOU EXPERIENCED A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP DURING YOUR STUDIES AT FAMU?

Yes _____ No _____

IF YOUR RESPONSE WAS "YES" TO QUESTION #1, GO ON TO QUESTION #III AND PROCEED WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRE. (Check the response of your choice.)

IF YOUR RESPONSE WAS "NO" TO QUESTIONS #I, GO TO QUESTION #II AND COMPLETE IT. RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE ADMINISTRATOR.

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE ITEMS TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY.
(Below is a scoring code:)

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
N = Neither Agree Nor Disagree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

II. I HAVE NOT DEVELOPED A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP DURING MY STUDY AT FAMU BECAUSE - (Please circle the response of your choice.)

---

a.	No one seemed to take an interest in me.	SA	A	N	D	SD
b.	I do not have an outgoing personality.	SA	A	N	D	SD
c.	I have found most of the advisors in my field to be conceited.	SA	A	N	D	SD
d.	I have found most of the advisors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.	SA	A	N	D	SD
e.	I have found most of the professors in my field to be conceited.	SA	A	N	D	SD
f.	I have found most of the professors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.	SA	A	N	D	SD
g.	I have found most of the University administrators to be conceited.	SA	A	N	D	SD
h.	I have found most of the University administrators to be preoccupied most of the time.	SA	A	N	D	SD
i.	I have found the Chaplain to be conceited.	SA	A	N	D	SD
j.	I have found the Chaplain to be preoccupied most of the time.	SA	A	N	D	SD
k.	I have found my peers to be conceited.	SA	A	N	D	SD
l.	I have found my peers to be preoccupied most of the time.	SA	A	N	D	SD
m.	I am a loner; therefore, I avoided the mentoring relationship.	SA	A	N	D	SD

III. COMPLETE THE ITEM BELOW BY PLACING A CHECK IN THE SPACE THAT BEST IDENTIFIES YOUR MENTOR.

_____ Advisor

_____ University Professor, Associate, Assistant, or Instructor

_____ University Staff

_____ University Administrator (President, Vice President, Dean, or Others)

_____ University Chaplain

_____ Peer

Other: (Specify) ______________________________

IV. LISTED BELOW ARE BEHAVIORS THAT HAVE BEEN EXHIBITED BY MENTORS. CHECK THE DEGREE TO WHICH EACH BEHAVIOR IS EXHIBITED BY YOUR MENTOR.

---

a.	My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about personal concerns.	SA	A	N	D	SD
b.	My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about professional concerns.	SA	A	N	D	SD
c.	My mentor teaches me how to use various interpresonal techniques, e.g., how to get along with others.	SA	A	N	D	SD
d.	My mentor believes in me and wholeheartedly supports me as a candidate for a future position in my field.					
e.	My mentor challenges, encourages, and assists me in improving the skills necessary to operate successfully in my field or area of concentration.	SA	A	N	D	SD
f.	My mentor exemplifies the essence of the professional qualities toward which I aspire.					

g.	My mentor's coaching helps me to improve my overall GPA (Grade Point Average).	SA	A	N	D	SD
h.	My mentor helps me to achieve my professional objectives.	SA	A	N	D	SD
i.	My mentor introduces me to influential people and informs me of opportunities which may further my career.	SA	A	N	D	SD
j.	My mentor stands up for me and defends me against others, even though I may have made an error.	SA	A	N	D	SD
k.	My mentor is recognized as a person with good ideas who gets positive results with the projects he/she undertakes.	SA	A	N	D	SD
l.	My mentor is sensitive to the experiences that I brought to FAMU.	SA	A	N	D	SD

V. THINK BACK OVER THE CRITICAL EVENTS AND QUALITIES OF YOUR MENTOR-PROTEGE' RELATIONSHIP. WHAT THINGS HELPED OR HINDERED THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS RELATIONSHIP? (Circle the extent to which each applies.)

---

a. THINGS THAT HINDERED THE RELATIONSHIP WERE:

1.	Moodiness on the part of the Mentor.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2.	Moodiness on the part of the protege'.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3.	Lack of punctual habits on the part of the protege'.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4.	Lack of punctual habits on the part of the protege'.	SA	A	N	D	SD

b. THINGS THAT HELPED THE RELATIONSHIP WERE:

1.	Helpfulness on the part of the mentor.	SA	A	N	D	SD
2.	Helpfulness on the part of the protege'.	SA	A	N	D	SD
3.	Openness to share problems and feelings.	SA	A	N	D	SD
4.	Availability of both mentor and protege'.	SA	A	N	D	SD

VI. IDENTIFY EVENTS WHICH LED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH YOUR MENTOR DURING YOUR STUDY AT FAMU. (Circle the response of your choice.)

---

a.	I needed help in adjusting to my courses of study.	SA	A	N	D	SD
b.	I needed help to determine if I was in the right field, i.e., career choice.	SA	A	N	D	SD
c.	I needed help in solving my study problems.	SA	A	N	D	SD
d.	I needed advice concerning my financial problems (books, food, rent, car, etc.).	SA	A	N	D	SD

VII. WHAT DID YOU ADMIRE ABOUT YOUR MENTOR?

---

a.	Courage	SA	A	N	D	SD
b.	Academic Skills	SA	A	N	D	SD
c.	Leadership Role	SA	A	N	D	SD
d.	Dedication and concern (caring)	SA	A	N	D	SD
e.	Good teaching skills	SA	A	N	D	SD

VIII. WHAT BENEFITS HAVE YOU GAINED FROM YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH YOUR MENTOR? (Please check the benefits that you gained from your mentor.) See Rating Scale Below:

5 = A very great deal
4 = A great deal
3 = Somewhat
2 = Very little
1 = Not at all

	5	4	3	2	1
a. Self-esteem					
b. Courage					
c. Determination					
d. A desire to achieve					
e. A desire to set goals for my future.					
f. Academic growth					

IX. WHAT QUALITIES DO YOU FEEL A MENTOR NEEDS TO EXHIBIT?

	5	4	3	2	1
a. Concern about my academic performance.					
b. Willingness to make constructive suggestions.					
c. Accessible to help.					
d. Provide moral support.					
e. Show interest in my professional growth.					
f. Capacity to establish connections for me.					

		5	4	3	2	1
g.	Willingness for mutual trust.					
h.	Open mindedness					
i.	Personifies good teaching					
j.	Easy to get along with.					

X. THE SIGNIFICANT QUALITIES OF YOUR IDEAL MENTOR WERE:

		5	4	3	2	1
a.	Strong self-concept					
b.	Experiences worth sharing.					
c.	Openness					
d.	Foresight					

XI. SOME NEGATIVE OUTCOMES FROM YOUR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP WERE:

		5	4	3	2	1
a.	Mentor withdrawal from the relationship.					
b.	Mentor jealous of protege'.					
c.	Mentor removed himself/herself from the area.					
d.	Protege' lost communication with mentor.					
e.	Mentor became too involved in personal functions to give the necessary time.					
f.	Mentor as "mother hen" to protege' (dependency).					
g.	Mentor and protege' acting as buddies.					

	5	4	3	2	1
h. Death of mentor.	___	___	___	___	___
i. Illness of mentor.	___	___	___	___	___

XII. WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL GRADE POINT AVERAGE?

____

Table 1-a-a

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS INDICATING WHETHER THEY EXPERIENCED A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP DURING THEIR STUDIES AT FAMU

CATAGORY OF RESPONSE	N	PERCENT	MEAN	STD-DEV
Yes	379	69.7	1.302	.460
No	164	30.1		
No Response	1	.2		

TABLE 1-a-b

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE OF STUDENTS BY SEX INDICATING THAT THEY HAVE OR HAVE NOT EXPERIENCED A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP AT FAMU

SEX AND RESPONSE	N	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL RESPONDING YES BY SEX	PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLE RESPONDING YES BY SEX	PERCENTAGE PORTION OF 100% RESPONDING YES & NO BY SEX	TOTALS
(Yes)					
Male	135	35.9	66.5	25.0	376
Female	241	64.1	71.5	44.6	69.6
Totals	376			69.6	
(No)					
Male	58	41.5	58.5	12.6	164
Female	96	33.5	28.5	17.8	30.4
Totals	164			30.4	540
GRAND TOTAL RESPONSES	540			100.0	100.0

Corrected CHI Square = 1.27662 - 1 Degree of Freedom Significance .2585

Raw CHI Square = 1.50424 - 1 Degree of Freedom Significance .2200

TABLE 1-B

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS BY SEX

SEX	N	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PCT)	MEAN	STD-DEV
Male	203	37.3	1.625	.485
Female	338	62.1		
Blank	3	.6		

TABLE 1-a-c

PERCENTAGE RESPONSE OF STUDENTS BY CLASS

CATEGORY LABEL	N	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PCT)	MEAN	STD-DEV
Freshmen	27	5.0	3.018	.862
Sophomore	115	21.1		
Junior	221	40.6		
Senior	179	32.6		
Blank	2	.4		

TABLE 1-A-B

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE OF STUDENTS BY RACE

CATEGORY LABEL	N	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PCT)	MEAN	STD-DEV
Asian	1	.2	2.357	.754
Black	420	77.2		
Hispanic	13	2.4		
White	87	16.0		
Blank	23	4.2		

TABLE 1-B

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS BY SEX

SEX	N	RELATIVE FREQUENCY (PCT)	MEAN	STD-DEV
Male	203	37.3	1.625	.485
Female	338	62.1		
Blank	3	.6		

TABLE 1-C

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS IDENTIFYING UNIVERSITY MENTORS

CATEGORY OF MENTORS	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENTS IDENTIFIED
Advisor	113	20.8	2.368	1.572	
Univ. Professor, Associate	160	29.4			
Univ. Staff	18	3.3			
Univ. Admin.	26	4.1			
Peer	44	8.1			
Blank	183	33.6			

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS INDICATING REASONS WHY THEY HAVE NOT DEVELOPED A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP AT FAMU

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	12	2.2	3.255	1.147	1. No one seemed to take an interest in me.
A	28	5.1			
N	54	9.9			
D	41	7.5			
SD	26	4.8			
Blank	383	70.4			
SA	5	.9	3.850	1.177	2. I do not have an outgoing personality.
A	24	4.4			
N	22	4.0			
D	48	8.8			
SD	61	11.2			
Blank	384	70.6			
SA	13	2.4	2.870	1.085	3. Found most of the advisors to be preoccupied most of the time.
A	56	10.3			
N	42	7.7			
D	39	7.2			
SD	11	2.0			
Blank	383	70.4			
SA	11	2.0	3.550	1.098	4. Found omst of the professors in my field to be conceited.
A	12	2.2			
N	46	8.5			
D	60	11.0			
SD	31	5.7			
Blank	384	70.6			

TABLE 2 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	12	2.2	3.050	1.143	5. Found most of the professors in my field to be preoccupied most of the time.
A	49	9.0			
N	33	6.1			
D	51	9.4			
SD	15	2.8			
Blank	384	70.6			
SA	12	2.2	3.287	1.086	6. Found most of the University administrators to be conceited.
A	19	3.5			
N	59	10.8			
D	46	8.5			
SD	21	3.9			
Blank	387	71.1			
SA	25	4.6	2.730	1.184	7. Found most of the University administrators to be preoccupied most of the time.
A	49	9.0			
N	43	7.9			
D	28	5.1			
SD	14	2.6			
Blank	385	70.8			
SA	3	.6	3.500	.880	8. Found the chaplin to be conceited.
A	2	.4			
N	96	17.6			
D	27	5.0			
SD	38	5.5			
Blank	386	71.0			

TABLE 2 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	1	.2	3.456	.826	9. Found the Chaplin to be preoccupied most of the time.
A	2	.9			
N	99	18.2			
D	27	5.0			
SD	26	4.8			
Blank	386	71.0			
SA	13	2.4	3.346	1.222	10. Found my peers to be conceited.
A	32	5.9			
N	30	5.5			
D	55	10.1			
SD	29	5.3			
Blank	385	70.8			
SA	3	.6	3.361	1.007	11. Found my peers to be preoccupied most of the time.
A	15	2.8			
N	22	4.0			
D	35	6.4			
SD	8	1.5			
Blank	461	84.7			
SA	3	.6	3.868	1.114	12. I am a longer; therefore, I avoided the mentoring relationship.
A	21	3.9			
N	29	5.3			
D	47	8.6			
SD	59	10.8			
Blank	385	70.8			

TABLE 3-A

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS BY SCHOOL AND COLLEGE INDICATING THAT THEY EXPERIENCED A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP DURING THEIR STAY AT FAMU

SCHOOL OR COLLEGE	N	% OF TOTAL SAMPLE RESPONDING YES BY SCHOOL OR COLLEGE	% OF SAMPLE RESPONDING YES BY SCHOOL OR COLLEGE	PORTION OF 100% ALL RESPONDING YES AND NO	TOTAL
Education	77	20.3	83.7	14.2	379
Business and Industry	47	12.4	52.8	8.7	69.8
Arts and Sciences	60	15.8	68.2	11.0	
Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture	15	4.0	60.0	2.8	
Pharmacy	37	9.8	62.7	6.8	
Engineering	23	6.1	69.7	4.2	
Journalism	31	8.2	77.5	5.7	
Architecture	18	4.7	62.1	3.3	
Nursing	18	4.7	75.0	3.3	
Allied Health	53	14.0	82.8	9.8	
TOTAL					379 69.8

TABLE 3-B

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS BY SCHOOL AND COLLEGE INDICATING THAT THEY DID NOT EXPERIENCE A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP DURING THEIR STUDY AT FAMU

SCHOOL OR COLLEGE	N	% OF TOTAL SAMPLE RESPONDING YES BY SCHOOL OR COLLEGE	% OF SAMPLE RESPONDING YES BY SCHOOL OR COLLEGE	PORTION OF 100% ALL RESPONDING YES AND NO	TOTAL
Education	15	9.1	16.3	2.8	164
Business and Industry	42	25.6	47.2	7.7	30.2
Arts and Sciences	28	17.1	31.8	5.2	
Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture	10	6.1	40.0	1.8	
Pharmacy	22	13.4	37.3	4.1	
Engineering	10	6.1	30.3	1.8	
Journalism	9	5.5	22.5	1.7	
Architecture	11	6.7	37.9	2.0	
Nursing	6	3.7	25.0	1.1	
Allied Health	11	6.7	17.2	2.0	
TOTAL					164 30.2

CHI Square 30.65547 - 9 Degrees of Freedom - Significance = .0003

TABLE

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS BY CLASS INDICATING THAT THEY HAVE OR HAVE NOT EXPERIENCED A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP DURING THEIR STUDY AT FAMU

CLASS	RESPONSE	N	% OF TOTAL BY CLASS	% OF SAMPLE RESPONDING BY CLASS	% OF PORTION OF 100% BY CLASS
Freshman	Yes	12	3.2	44.4	2.2
Sophomore	Yes	79	20.9	68.7	14.6
Junior	Yes	157	41.5	71.0	29.0
Senior	Yes	130	34.4	73.0	24.0
TOTAL	Yes	378	69.9		
Freshman	No	15	9.2	55.6	2.8
Sophomore	No	36	22.1	31.3	6.7
Junior	No	64	39.3	29.0	11.8
Senior	No	48	29.4	27.0	8.9
TOTAL	No	163	30.1		
GRAND TOTAL		541	100.0		100.0

CHI Square = 9.35677 - 3 Degrees of Freedom - Significance = .0249

TABLE

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS BY RACE INDICATING THAT THEY HAVE EXPERIENCED A MENTORING RELATIONSHIP DURING THEIR STUDY AT FAMU

RACE	N	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL RESPONDING YES BY RACE	PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLE RESPONDING YES BY RACE	% PORTION OF 100% (ALL) RESPONDING YES & NO BY RACE	TOTAL
Asian	1	.3	100.0	.2	362
Black	288	79.6	68.7	55.4	69.6
Hispanic	9	2.5	69.2	1.7	
White	64	17.7	73.6	12.3	

CHI Square = 1.23191 - 3 Degrees of Freedom - Significance = .7454

TABLE

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS BY RACE INDICATING THAT THEY HAVE NOT HAD A MENTORING EXPERIENCE DURING THEIR STUDY AT FAMU

RACE	N	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL RESPONDING NO BY RACE	PERCENTAGE OF SAMPLE RESPONDING NO BY RACE	% PORTION OF 100% (ALL) RESPONDING YES & NO BY RACE	TOTAL
Asian	0	0	0	0	158
Black	131	82.9	31.3	25.2	30.4
Hispanic	4	2.5	30.8	.8	
White	23	14.6	26.4	4.4	

CHI Square = 1.23191 - 3 Degrees of Freedom - Significance = .7454

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS IDENTIFYING BEHAVIORS THAT HAVE BEEN EXHIBITED BY MENTORS

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	140	25.7	1.780	.722	1. My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about personal concerns.
A	188	34.6			
N	45	8.3			
D	3	.6			
SD	2	.4			
Blank	166	30.5			
SA	164	30.1	1.662	.681	2. My mentor is interested and available to hear and counsel me about professional concerns.
A	182	33.5			
N	24	4.4			
D	5	.9			
SD	1	.2			
Blank	168	30.9			
SA	90	16.5	2.247	.948	3. My mentor teaches me how to use various interpersonal techniques e.g., how to get along with others.
A	144	26.5			
N	107	19.7			
D	32	5.9			
SD	4	.7			
Blank	167	30.7			
SA	158	29.0	1.745	.754	4. My mentor believes in me and wholeheartedly supports me as a candidate for a future position in my field.
A	165	30.3			
N	47	8.6			
D	6	1.1			
SD	1	.2			
Blank	167	30.7			

TABLE 4 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	158	29.0	1.731	.749	5. My mentor challenges, encourages, and assists me in improving the skills necessary to operate successfully in my field or area of concentration.
A	170	31.3			
N	38	7.0			
D	8	1.5			
SD	1	.2			
Blank	169	31.1			
SA	148	27.2	1.778	.762	6. My mentor exemplifies the essence of the professional qualities toward which I aspire.
A	168	31.1			
N	52	9.6			
D	2	.4			
SD	3	.6			
Blank	170	31.3			
SA	99	18.2	2.131	.917	7. My mentor's coaching helps me to improve my overall GPA (Grade (Grade Point Average).
A	159	29.2			
N	92	16.9			
D	19	3.5			
SD	6	1.1			
Blank	169	31.1			
SA	99	18.2	1.920	.698	8. My mentor helps me to achieve my professional objectives.
A	213	39.2			
N	56	10.3			
D	5	.9			
SD	1	.2			
Blank	170	31.3			

TABLE 4 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	91	16.7	2.248	.970	9. My mentor introduces me to influential people and informs me of opportunities which may further my career.
A	145	26.7			
N	99	18.2			
D	35	6.4			
SD	5	.9			
Blank	169	31.1			
SA	42	7.7	2.798	1.018	10. My mentor stands up for me and defends me against others, even though I may have made an error.
A	92	16.9			
N	164	30.1			
D	56	10.3			
SD	22	4.0			
Blank	168	30.9			
SA	153	28.1	1.721	.691	11. My mentor is recognized as a person with good ideas who gets positive results with the projects he/she undertakes.
A	180	33.1			
N	40	7.4			
D	4	.7			
SD	0	0			
Blank	169	30.7			
SA	99	18.2	2.082	.824	12. My mentor is sensitive to the experiences that I brought to FAMU.
A	159	29.2			
N	108	19.9			
D	8	1.5			
SD	2	.4			
Blank	168	30.9			

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS INDICATING CRITICAL EVENTS THAT MAY HAVE HELPED OR HINDERED THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
					(a) THINGS THAT HINDERED THE RELATIONSHIP WERE:
SA	14	2.6	2.477	1.098	1. Moodiness on the part of the mentor.
A	54	9.9			
N	102	18.8			
D	117	21.5			
SD	78	14.3			
Blank	179	32.9			
SA	14	2.6	2.735	1.090	2. Moodiness on the part of the protege.
A	83	15.3			
N	112	20.6			
D	99	18.2			
SD	54	9.9			
Blank	182	33.5			
SA	7	1.3	2.285	1.013	3. Lack of punctual habits on the part of the mentor.
A	36	6.6			
N	103	18.9			
D	126	23.2			
SD	92	16.9			
Blank	180	33.1			
SA	3	.6	2.433	1.002	4. Lack of punctual habits on the part of the protege.
A	54	9.9			
N	112	20.6			
D	118	21.7			
SD	73	13.4			
Blank	184	33.8			

TABLE 5 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
					(b) THINGS THAT HELPED THE RELATIONSHIP WERE:
SA	149	27.4	1.702	.681	1. Helpfulness on the part of the mentor.
A	192	35.3			
N	26	4.8			
D	3	.6			
SD	2	.4			
Blank	172	31.6			
SA					2. Helpfulness on the part of the protege.
A					
N					
D					
SD					
Blank					
SA	102	18.8	2.008	.788	3. Openness to share problems and feelings.
A	174	32.0			
N	83	15.3			
D	11	2.0			
SD	0	0			
Blank	174	32.0			
SA	106	19.5	1.948	.806	4. Availability of both mentor and portege.
A	194	35.7			
N	50	9.2			
D	14	2.6			
SD	3	.6			
Blank	177	32.5			

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS IDENTIFYING EVENTS WHICH LED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MENTOR AT FAMU

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	62	11.4	2.535	1.112	a. Needed help in adjusting to my courses of study.
A	150	27.6			
N	79	14.5			
D	61	11.2			
SD	20	3.7			
Blank	171	31.4			
SA	53	9.7	2.810	1.184	b. Needed help to determine if I was in the right field, i.e., career choice.
A	111	20.4			
N	96	17.6			
D	80	14.7			
SD	33	6.1			
Blank	171	31.4			
SA	54	9.9	2.610	1.090	c. Needed help in solving my study problems.
A	136	25.0			
N	106	19.5			
D	53	9.7			
SD	23	4.2			
Blank	172	31.6			
SA	53	9.7	2.810	1.184	d. Needed help to determine if I was in the right field, i.e., career choice.
A	111	20.4			
N	96	17.6			
D	80	14.7			
SD	33	6.1			
Blank	171	31.4			

TABLE 6 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	54	9.9	2.610	1.090	e. Needed help in solving my study problems.
A	136	25.0			
N	106	19.5			
D	53	9.7			
SD	23	4.2			
Blank	172	31.6			
SA	64	11.8	2.845	1.235	f. Needed advice concerning my financial problems (books, food, rent, car, etc.).
A	89	16.4			
N	99	18.2			
D	85	15.6			
SD	37	6.8			
Blank	170	31.3			

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS IDENTIFYING QUALITIES ADMIRED ABOUT MENTORS

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	108	19.9	2.027	.824	a. Courage
A	150	27.6			
N	99	18.2			
D	8	1.5			
SD	1	.2			
Blank	178	32.7			
SA	167	30.7	1.728	.787	b. Academic Skills
A	141	25.9			
N	53	9.7			
D	4	.7			
SD	2	.4			
Blank	177	32.5			
SA	197	36.2	1.606	.744	c. Leadership Role
A	129	23.7			
N	40	7.4			
D	4	.7			
SD	1	.2			
Blank	173	31.8			
SA	225	41.4	1.469	.658	d. Dedication and concern (caring)
A	123	22.6			
N	19	3.5			
D	3	.6			
SD	1	.2			
Blank	173	31.8			

TABLE 7 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
SA	164	30.1	1.806	.873	e. Good teaching skills
A	130	23.9			
N	67	12.3			
D	5	.9			
SD	5	.9			
Blank	173	31.8			

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS INDICATING BENEFITS GAINED FROM RELATIONSHIPS WITH MENTORS

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.		EVENT IDENTIFIED
Not at all	2	.4	4.038	.874	a.	Self-esteem.
Very little	13	2.4				
Somewhat	84	15.4				
Great deal	143	26.3				
Very great deal	130	23.9				
Blank	172	31.6				
Not at all	3	.6	3.830	.890	b.	Courage
Very little	21	3.9				
Somewhat	102	18.8				
Great deal	154	28.3				
Very great deal	90	16.5				
Blank	174	32.0				
Not at all	0	0	4.271	.772	c.	Determination
Very little	10	1.8				
Somewhat	44	8.1				
Great deal	154	28.3				
Very great deal	165	30.3				
Blank	171	31.4				
Not at all	1	.2	4.424	.750	d.	A desire to achieve.
Very little	6	1.1				
Somewhat	35	6.4				
Great deal	123	22.6				
Very great deal	208	38.2				
Blank	171	31.4				

TABLE 8 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
Not at all	1	.2	4.351	.800	e. A desire to set goals for my future.
Very little	9	1.7			
Somewhat	43	7.9			
Great deal	123	22.6			
A very great deal	194	35.7			
Blank	174	32.0			
Not at all	2	.4	4.147	.784	f. Academic growth.
Very little	7	1.3			
Somewhat	58	10.7			
Great deal	173	31.8			
A very great deal	133	24.4			
Blank	171	31.4			

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS IDENTIFYING QUALITIES NEEDED TO BE EXHIBITED BY MENTORS

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.		EVENT IDENTIFIED
Not at all	16	2.9	4.323	.998	a.	Concern about my academic performance.
Very little	7	1.3				
Somewhat	27	5.0				
Great deal	113	20.8				
Very great deal	209	38.4				
Blank	172	31.6				
Not at all	14	2.6	4.306	.984	b.	Willingness to make constructive suggestions.
Very little	11	2.0				
Somewhat	23	4.2				
Great deal	123	22.6				
Very great deal	201	36.9				
Blank	172	31.6				
Not at all	16	2.9	4.264	.997	c.	Accessible to help.
Very little	5	.9				
Somewhat	37	6.8				
Great deal	120	22.1				
Very great deal	193	35.5				
Blank	173	31.8				
Not at all	16	2.9	4.197	1.012	d.	Provide moral support.
Very little	9	1.7				
Somewhat	37	6.8				
Great deal	133	24.4				
Very great deal	176	32.4				
Blank	173	31.8				

TABLE 9 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
Not at all	17	3.1	4.269	1.027	e. Show interest in my professional growth.
Very little	8	1.5			
Somewhat	33	6.1			
Great deal	114	21.0			
Very great deal	200	36.8			
Blank	172	31.6			
Not at all	16	2.9	3.865	1.096	f. Capacity to establish connections for me.
Very little	24	4.4			
Somewhat	82	15.1			
Great deal	120	22.1			
Very great deal	128	23.5			
Blank	174	32.0			
Not at all	17	3.1	4.230	1.037	g. Willingness for mutual trust.
Very little	8	1.5			
Somewhat	39	7.2			
Great deal	114	21.0			
Very great deal	191	35.1			
Blank	175	32.2			
Not at all	16	2.9	4.321	1.007	h. Open mindedness.
Very little	9	1.7			
Somewhat	23	4.2			
Great deal	113	20.8			
Very great deal	207	38.1			
Blank	176	32.4			

TABLE 9 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
Not at all	16	2.9	4.161	1.053	i. Personifies good teaching.
Very little	8	1.5			
Somewhat	43	7.9			
Great deal	108	19.9			
Very great deal	161	29.6			
Blank	208	38.2			
Not at all	14	2.6	4.281	1.020	j. Easy to get along with.
Very little	8	1.5			
Somewhat	32	5.9			
Great deal	97	17.8			
Very great deal	184	33.8			
Blank	209	38.4			

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS IDENTIFYING QUALITIES OF IDEAL MENTOR

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
Very little	4	.7	4.485	.678	a. Strong self-concept.
Somewhat	26	4.8			
Great deal	124	22.8			
Very great deal	211	38.8			
Blank	179	32.9			
Very little	5	.9	4.369	.732	b. Experiences worth sharing.
Somewhat	40	7.4			
Great deal	136	25.0			
Very great deal	184	33.8			
Blank	179	32.9			
Very little	2	.4	4.422	.705	c. Openness.
Somewhat	40	7.4			
Great deal	125	23.0			
Very great deal	198	36.4			
Blank	179	32.9			
Not at all	1	.2	1.782	1.078	d. Foresight.
Very little	1	.2			
Somewhat	44	8.1			
Great deal	143	26.3			
Very great deal	175	32.2			
Blank	180	33.1			

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES OF STUDENTS IDENTIFYING SOME NEGATIVE OUTCOMES OF THEIR MENTOR RELATIONSHIP

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
Not at all	200	36.8	1.782	1.078	a. Mentor withdrawal from the relationship.
Very little	79	14.5			
Somewhat	48	8.8			
Great deal	19	3.5			
Very great	12	2.2			
Blank	186	34.2			
Not at all	261	48.0	1.782	.968	b. Mentor jealous of protege.
Very little	52	9.6			
Somewhat	25	4.6			
Great deal	15	2.8			
Very great deal	9	1.7			
Blank	182	33.5			
Not at all	221	40.6	1.731	1.132	c. Mentor removed himself/herself from the area.
Very little	62	11.4			
Somewhat	40	7.4			
Great deal	17	3.1			
Very great deal	17	3.1			
Blank	187	34.4			
Not at all	191	35.1	1.983	1.230	d. Protege lost communication with mentor.
Very little	50	9.2			
Somewhat	67	12.3			
Great deal	35	6.4			
Very great deal	16	2.9			
Blank	185	34.0			

TABLE 11 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
Not at all	207	38.1	1.763	1.067	e. Mentor became too involved in personal functions to give the necessary time.
Very little	69	12.7			
Somewhat	51	9.4			
Great deal	22	4.0			
Very great deal	9	1.7			
Blank	186	34.2			
Not at all	219	40.3	1.743	1.108	f. Mentor as "mother hen" to protege (dependency).
Very little	57	10.5			
Somewhat	50	9.2			
Great deal	19	3.5			
Very great deal	13	2.4			
Blank	186	34.2			
Not at all	174	32.0	1.986	1.172	g. Mentor and protege acting as buddies.
Very little	65	11.9			
Somewhat	67	12.3			
Great deal	33	6.1			
Very great deal	12	2.2			
Blank	193	35.5			
Not at all	294	54.0	1.352	.903	h. Death of mentor.
Very little	19	3.5			
Somewhat	22	4.0			
Great deal	7	1.3			
Very great deal	10	1.8			
Blank	192	35.3			

TABLE 11 (continued)

RESPONSE LEVEL	NUMBER RESPONDING	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	MEAN	STD. DEV.	EVENT IDENTIFIED
Not at all	282	52.8	1.406	.935	i. Illness of mentor.
Very little	26	4.8			
Somewhat	24	4.4			
Great deal	11	2.0			
Very great deal	9	1.7			
Blank	192	35.3			

TABLE 12
PERCENTAGE RESPONSE OF STUDENTS INDICATING THEIR GRADE POINT AVERAGE

GPA	N FREQ	ADJ PCT	CUM PCT	GPA CODE	N FREQ	ADJ PCT	CUM PCT	GPA CODE	N FREQ	ADJ PCT	CUM PCT
2.00	33	7	7	2.79	3	1	43	3.33	1	0	83
2.05	1	0	7	2.80	25	5	48	3.34	1	0	83
2.06	1	0	7	2.82	1	0	48	3.36	1	0	83
2.07	1	0	7	2.83	1	0	48	3.40	10	2	85
2.09	2	0	8	2.85	3	1	49	3.43	1	0	85
2.10	3	1	8	2.87	2	0	49	3.44	1	0	85
2.20	4	1	9	2.88	1	0	49	3.45	2	0	86
2.24	1	0	9	2.89	4	1	50	3.47	2	0	86
2.25	2	0	10	2.90	14	3	53	3.48	2	0	87
2.28	1	0	10	2.91	1	0	53	3.50	20	4	91
2.30	3	1	11	2.92	1	0	53	3.51	1	0	91
2.31	1	0	11	2.94	2	0	54	3.53	1	0	91
2.34	1	0	11	2.95	2	0	54	3.54	1	0	91
2.40	6	1	12	2.97	5	1	55	3.57	1	0	91
2.42	1	0	12	2.98	3	1	56	3.59	1	0	92
2.46	1	0	13	2.99	2	0	56	3.60	3	1	92
2.49	2	0	13	3.00	59	12	68	3.61	1	0	93
2.50	64	13	26	3.01	1	0	68	3.62	1	0	93
2.51	1	0	26	3.02	1	0	69	3.63	1	0	93
2.53	2	0	27	3.03	1	0	69	3.67	1	0	93
2.54	4	1	27	3.05	2	0	69	3.69	1	0	93
2.56	4	1	28	3.06	1	0	69	3.70	6	1	95
2.57	2	0	29	3.07	1	0	70	3.71	1	0	95
2.58	2	0	29	3.08	2	0	70	3.73	2	0	95
2.59	1	0	29	3.09	1	0	70	3.74	1	0	95
2.60	10	2	31	3.10	8	2	72	3.76	1	0	96
2.62	1	0	31	3.10	8	2	72	3.76	1	0	96
2.65	4	1	32	3.14	3	1	73	3.79	1	0	96
2.67	2	0	33	3.17	2	0	73	3.80	1	0	96
2.68	2	0	33	3.18	1	0	73	3.83	2	0	97
2.69	1	0	33	3.19	1	0	73	3.85	1	0	97
2.70	31	6	39	3.20	23	5	78	3.86	1	0	97
2.71	1	0	40	3.22	1	0	78	3.90	3	1	98
2.73	1	0	40	3.23	4	1	79	3.93	1	0	98
2.75	5	1	41	3.27	4	1	80	3.96	1	0	98
2.76	3	1	41	3.28	1	0	80	3.99	1	0	98
2.77	1	0	42	3.29	1	0	80	4.00	8	2	100
2.78	2	0	42	3.30	10	2	82				

Mean 2.885 Std. Dev. .475

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE RESONSE OF STUDENTS BY SCHOOL

SCHOOL CATEGORY LABEL	CODE	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ. (PCT)	ADJUSTED FREQ (PCT)	CUM FREQ (PCT)
Education	1.	92	16.9	16.9	16.9
Business and Industry	2.	89	16.4	16.4	33.3
Arts and Sciences	3.	88	16.2	16.2	49.4
Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture	4.	25	4.6	4.6	54.0
Pharmacy	5.	59	10.8	10.8	64.9
Engineering	6.	33	6.1	6.1	71.0
Journalism	7.	41	7.5	7.5	78.5
Architecture	8.	29	5.3	5.3	83.8
Nursing	9.	24	4.4	4.4	88.2
Allied Health Sciences	10.	64	11.8	11.8	100.0
TOTAL		544 422	100.0	100.0	

Mean 4.599 Std Dev 3.036